

**HISTORIC ITERATION
WITH $\aleph_\varepsilon$ -SUPPORT
SH538**

SAHARON SHELAH

Institute of Mathematics
The Hebrew University
Jerusalem, Israel

Rutgers University
Department of Mathematics
New Brunswick, NJ USA

ABSTRACT. One aim of this work is to get a universe in which weak versions of Martin axioms holds for some forcing notions of cardinality $\aleph_0, \aleph_1$ and $\aleph_2$ while on $\aleph_2$ club, the “small” brother of diamond, holds. As a consequence we get the consistency of “there is no Gross space”. Another aim is to present a case of “Historic iteration”.

I thank Otmar Spinas, Juris Steprans and Boban Velickovic for the helpful discussion.
I thank Alice Leonhardt for the beautiful typing.
Latest Revision 96/Aug/2
Originally typed 94/Jan/23 elsewhere

Typeset by $\mathcal{A}\mathcal{M}\mathcal{S}$ -TEX

§1

When we make the continuum $> \aleph_2$, it in general takes effort not to add $\aleph_2$ Cohen reals. We do it here, making a weak version of MA true without adding $\aleph_2$ Cohen reals (i.e. a function $f : \omega_2 \rightarrow \{0,1\}$ which is quite generic for the forcing notion $\{g : g \text{ a finite function from } \omega_2 \text{ to } \{0,1\}\}$). Moreover $\clubsuit_{S_0^2}$ is preserved. This was motivated by the following application to Gross spaces: the consistency of “there is no Gross space” with ZFC, prove in 1.24 below; on Gross spaces see e.g. Shelah Spinars [ShSi 468].

We prove that for a restricted enough family of σ -centered forcing, (essentially giving almost intersection to “definable” filters) we have:

- (a) for any $\aleph_1$ conditions, $\aleph_1$ of them belongs to a directed subset
- (b) for any $\aleph_2$ conditions, some $\aleph_2$ of them belongs to a directed subset
- (c) $\clubsuit_{\aleph_2}$
- (d) $2^{\aleph_0} = \aleph_3$.

This is enough; we can by the proof strengthen (a) (even to $\text{MA}_{\aleph_1}(\sigma\text{-centered})$), it is less clear about (b). This was our first approach, but it seems considerably clearer to prove just (b).

Definition 1.1 defines the family of c.c.c. forcing notions for which we will have our approximation to (weak) MA. A main Definition is 1.11, where we define the family of iterations we shall use. For preserving $\clubsuit_{S_0^2}$ we want, among any given $\aleph_2$ conditions $\langle p_i : i < \omega_2 \rangle$ to find (quite many) countable subsets $w \subseteq \omega_2$ such that $\{p_i : i \in w\}$ has an upper bound. So we have to “marry” the c.c.c. with somewhat countable support hence the name $\aleph_\varepsilon$ -support. The support is fashioned after “historic forcing” (see Shelah Stanley [ShSt 258]). We may continue this generalization to a larger family of forcing, replacing $\aleph_0$ by a larger cardinal (see 1.3(5)).

Note: $\clubsuit_{S_0^2} \Rightarrow$ for some $A \subseteq \aleph_2$ there is no $L[A]$ -generic ω_2 -sequence of Cohen reals $\Rightarrow \mathfrak{p} \leq \aleph_2$ (where $\mathfrak{p} \leq \aleph_2$ means for some $A_i \in D$ (for $i < \omega_2$), D is a filter on ω containing all co-finite sets, there is no $A \in [\omega]^{\aleph_0}$ such that $(\forall i < \omega_2)[A \subseteq^* A_i]$).

In 1.1-1.2 we deal with simple forcing, a very restricted class but sufficient for our need. In 1.3 we comment on generalizations, in 1.4 we fix some cardinal parameters. In 1.5 - 1.10 we deal with “creatures”, they represent possible “support” of a condition in the iteration to be defined later. In 1.11 we define our iteration and prove basic facts by simultaneous induction of length. In 1.12 - 1.18 we further investigate the iteration. In 1.19 - 1.23 we get the actual consistency results.

Notation: Let u, v denote creatures (see Definition 1.5 below), $\mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{q}, \mathfrak{r}$ denote conditions, (in the iteration), $\tau, \xi, \zeta, \varepsilon$ denote countable ordinals (for depth of creatures or conditions) and $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta$ denote ordinals. We use $\varphi, \psi, \Phi, \Psi$ only as in Definition 1.5.

The following looks extremely special but includes the forcing notion needed for the application to Gross spaces. See Example 1.3(3); we may consider some generalizations.

1.1 Definition. 1) A forcing notion Q is a simple forcing notion if:

- (a) for some $S \subseteq \bigcup_{n < \omega} {}^n\omega : p \in Q \iff p$ has the form $(s, \mathbf{t})$ where:
 - $s \in S$ and $\mathbf{t}$ is a finite subset of ${}^\omega\omega$
- (b) $(s^1, \mathbf{t}^1) \leq (s^2, \mathbf{t}^2)$ implies $s^1 \subseteq s^2$ & $\mathbf{t}^1 \subseteq \mathbf{t}^2$
- (c) $(s, \mathbf{t}') \leq (s, \mathbf{t}'')$ whenever $\mathbf{t}' \subseteq \mathbf{t}''$ and $s \in S$, also $(\emptyset, \emptyset) \in Q$ and $(\emptyset, \emptyset) \leq (s, \mathbf{t})$
- (d) for some two-place functions f, g [with domain and range $\subseteq \mathcal{H}(\aleph_0)$ - called the witnesses], $\iff (s, \mathbf{t}) \in Q, m < \omega, |\{t \restriction k : t \in \mathbf{t}\}| \leq m, \text{Dom}(s) = n \text{ and } k = f(n, m) \text{ then } (s, \mathbf{t}) \leq (s^+, \mathbf{t}) \in Q$ and $s^+(n) \neq 0$ where $s^+ = s \cup \{\langle n, g(s, \{t_\ell \restriction k : \ell < m\}) \rangle\}$ (so part of the conclusion is “ $g(s, \{t_\ell \restriction k : \ell < m\})$ is well defined”; we allow f and g to be defined in additional cases for technical reasons)
- (e) if $(s, \mathbf{t}) \in Q$, $\text{Dom}(s) = n$ then $(s, \mathbf{t}) \leq (s \cup \{\langle n, 0 \rangle\}, \mathbf{t}) \in Q$
- (f) the truth value of $(s_1^1, \mathbf{t}^1) \leq (s_2^2, \mathbf{t}^2)$ depend just on $(s_1, \{\eta \restriction \ell g(s^2) : \eta \in \mathbf{t}^1\}, s_2, \{\eta \restriction \ell g(s^2) : \eta \in \mathbf{t}^2\})$ (not really needed but natural).

2) If $\mathbf{t}^1, \mathbf{t}^2 \subseteq {}^\omega\omega$ let $(s^1, \mathbf{t}^1) \leq_Q (s^2, \mathbf{t}^2)$ means: for every finite $\mathbf{t}_1$ of $\mathbf{t}^1$ for some finite subset $\mathbf{t}_2$ of $\mathbf{t}^2$ we have $(s^1, \mathbf{t}_1) \leq_Q (s^2, \mathbf{t}_2)$.

3) If Q is a simple forcing notion we say X describes Q if $X = S_Q = (S, Y)$ where $Y = \{(s, n, \ell, k, \bar{t}) : s \in S, t = \langle t_\ell : \ell < \ell^* \rangle, t_\ell \in {}^k\omega \text{ and: } \mathbf{t} \subseteq {}^\omega\omega \text{ finite, } \{t \restriction k : t \in \mathbf{t}\} \subseteq \{t_\ell : \ell < \ell^*\} \Rightarrow (s, \mathbf{t}) \leq (s^\wedge \langle \ell \rangle, \mathbf{t})\}$ (so from X , we can compute f, g (more exactly, the Borel set of pairs (f, g) which are as required).)

1.2 Examples: The following are simple forcing notions:

1) Cohen forcing, here $S \equiv \bigcup_{n < \omega} {}^n2$ and $(s^1, \mathbf{t}^1) \leq (s^2, \mathbf{t}^2)$ iff $s^1 \subseteq s^2, \mathbf{t}^1 \subseteq \mathbf{t}^2$. Here $f(n, m) = 1, g(s, \{t_\ell \restriction k : \ell < m\}) = 1$ are O.K.

2) Dominating real forcing = Hechler forcing: $(s^1, \mathbf{t}^1) \leq (s^2, \mathbf{t}^2)$ iff $s^1 \subseteq s^2, \mathbf{t}^1 \subseteq \mathbf{t}^2$ and $[n \in \text{Dom}(s^2) \setminus \text{Dom}(s^1) \text{ \& } t \in \mathbf{t}^1 \text{ \& } s^2(n) \neq 0 \Rightarrow s^2(n) \geq t(n)]$. Here $f(n, m) = n + 1, g(s, \{t_\ell \restriction k : \ell < m\}) = \text{Max}[\{(t_\ell \restriction k)(n) + 1 : \ell < m\} \cup \{1\}]$ are O.K.

3) Vector spaces forcing = Spinax forcing: let K be a countable field, $\mathcal{U}$ a vector space with dimension $\aleph_0$ and free basis $X = \{x_n : n < \omega\}$; without loss of generality $K \subseteq K^*, K^*$ is a countable algebraically closed field with transcendence dimension $\aleph_0$ and 0_{K^*} (the zero of K^*) is the ordinal 0, $\mathcal{U}^*$ is the K^* -vector space extending $\mathcal{U}$ and they have a common basic X and $0_{\mathcal{U}^*} = 0$ and the set of elements of K^* is ω and also the set of elements of $\mathcal{U}^*$ is exactly ω . We can assume that $K^*, \mathcal{U}^* \in L$.

For $f : \omega \rightarrow K^*$ let $f^{\text{HOM}} \left(\sum_{m < n} a_m x_m \right) = \sum_{m < n} a_m f(m)$ for any $a_m \in K^*$, so f^{HOM}

is a functional from $\mathcal{U}^*$ to K^* and $f^{\text{HOM}} \restriction \mathcal{U}$ is functional from $\mathcal{U}$ to K .

We define $\text{support}(\sum_{m < \omega} a_m x_m) = \{m < \omega : a_m \neq 0_K\}$ for $\sum_{m < \omega} a_m x_m \in \mathcal{U}^*$ and also

$\text{content}(\sum_{m < \omega} a_m x_m) = \{a_m : m < \omega\}$.

We define $P = P_{\mathcal{U}}$ as the following simple forcing notion; so the set of members is defined by 1.1(a) where:

- (a) $S = \{s : \text{for some } n, s \text{ is a function}^1 \text{ from } \{0, \dots, n-1\} \text{ to } \mathcal{U}(\subseteq \omega) \text{ such that } \langle s(\ell) : \ell \in \text{Dom}(s) \text{ and } s(\ell) \neq 0_{\mathcal{U}^*} \rangle \text{ is linearly independent}\}$
- (b) $(s^1, \mathbf{t}) \leq (s^2, \mathbf{t}^2)$ iff $s^1 \subseteq s^2, \mathbf{t}^1 \subseteq \mathbf{t}^2$ and $[n \in \text{Dom}(s^2) \setminus \text{Dom}(s^1) \ \& \ t \in \mathbf{t} \ \& \ \text{Rang}(t) \subseteq K \Rightarrow t^{\text{HOM}}(s^2(n)) = 0]$.

Here the following f, g are O.K.: $f(n, m) = n + m + 1, g(s, \{t_\ell \upharpoonright k : \ell < m\}) = \text{first } x \in \mathcal{U}^* \text{ under the order of the natural numbers such that: } x \text{ has the form } \sum_{\ell < m} a_\ell x_\ell, x$

is not zero, and each a_ℓ is in the subfield K_x of K^* generated by $\bigcup_{\ell < k} \bigcup_{y \in \text{Rang}(t_\ell)}$

$\text{content}(y) \cup \bigcup_{y \in \text{Rang}(s)} \text{content}(y)$ and $t_\ell^{\text{HOM}}(x) = 0$ for $\ell < m$. This works as

for any n linear maps from a vector space over K of dimension $n + m + 1$ to F , the intersection of their kernels has dimension at least $n + 1$ and we can restrict ourselves to the vector space over K_x generated by $\{x_\ell : \ell < n + m + 1\}$.

4) Let Q be defined by

- (a) $S = \{s : s \text{ is a finite sequence, } s(\ell) \text{ is a finite subset of } \omega, |s(\ell)| \leq \ell + 1\}$
- (b) $(s^1, \mathbf{t}^1) \leq (s^2, \mathbf{t}^2)$ iff: $s^1 \subseteq s^2, \mathbf{t}^1 \subseteq \mathbf{t}^2$ and
if $n \in \text{Dom}(s^2) \setminus \text{Dom}(s^1)$ and $s^2(n) \neq \emptyset$ then $(\forall t \in \mathbf{t}^1)(t(n) \in s^2(n))$.

Note that this forcing suffices. The value $\emptyset$ has little influence of our purpose. Seemingly we can suppress it at the expense of a slight burden on the iteration: making the m in (*) of 1.15 be part of the condition; did not check.

1.3 Discussion. 1) We shall work with simple forcing as we cannot iterate Mathias forcing as this will make $\mathfrak{p}$ large hence by Bell [B] theorem $\text{MA}(\sigma\text{-centered})$ holds, hence $\clubsuit$ fails so all this illustrates why we use the highly specialized “simple forcing”.

2) Can we get $\clubsuit$ with $\text{otp}(C_\delta) > \omega$? Well, we need to have $\theta_\xi > \omega$ and to allow to divide the set θ_ξ to finitely many convex parts, and this is done here.

3) Can we get $\text{MA}_{\aleph_1}[\sigma\text{-centered}]$? seems yes.

4) We may use more strongly the $2^{\aleph_0} = \aleph_1$ in the end: $k_\xi = 2 \Rightarrow$ the u_ξ are submodel of some $\mathfrak{B}$.

5) We can generalize replacing $\aleph_0$ by $\sigma = \sigma^{<\sigma}$, so in 1.4 below we demand $\kappa = \text{cf}(\kappa) > \sigma, \{1, 2\} \subseteq \Theta \subseteq \sigma^+$, we use a strong version of σ^+ -c.c. (e.g. as in [Sh 80]).

* * *

¹we could demand: if $n_1 < n_2 < n, s(n_\ell) = \sum_m a_m x_m \in \mathcal{U} \setminus \{0_{\mathcal{U}}\}$; then $\max(\text{support}(s(n_1))) < \max(\text{support}(s(n_2)))$. We define $\text{support}(\sum_{m < \omega} a_m x_m) = \{m < \omega : a_m \neq 0_K\}$ for $\sum_{m < \omega} a_m x_m \in \mathcal{U}^*$ and also $\text{content}(\sum_{m < \omega} a_m, x_m) = \{a_m : m < \omega\}$. It appears more convenient to use the present definition.

The following defines a “domain”, “base”, “carrier” of a condition in the iterations defined in the Main Definition 1.11 below. For a more detailed explanation, see after the Definition.

- 1.4 *Context.* 1) κ will be regular uncountable, can be chosen as $\aleph_1$.
 2) Θ be a set of ordinals $\in (0, \kappa)$, $1 \in \Theta$, $\Theta \neq \{1\}$; now we shall need: $\Theta \subseteq \omega_1$ (in 1.15) and $2 \in \Theta$ (or just $\Theta \cap [2, \omega) \neq \emptyset$); in 1.20(1) the case $\Theta = \{1, 2, \omega\}$, really here $V \models GCH$, $\kappa = \aleph_1$, $\mu = \aleph_2$ suffice for the main theorem (the other cases arise when we want to strengthen $\clubsuit$).
 3) $\text{cf}(\mu) \geq \kappa$.

1.5 Definition. Let $\zeta < \kappa$, α an ordinal. An (α, ζ, Θ) -creature u is a sequence $\langle \zeta, \bar{k}, \beta, \bar{\theta}, \bar{\psi}, \bar{w}, \bar{F} \rangle$ where (but we may suppress Θ , being constant):

- (a) $\bar{k} = \langle k_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \zeta \rangle$ where $k_\varepsilon \in \{1, 2\}$
- (b) $\bar{\theta} = \langle \theta_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \zeta \rangle$ satisfying:
 $[k_\varepsilon = 1 \Rightarrow \theta_\varepsilon = 1]$ and $[k_\varepsilon = 2 \Rightarrow \theta_\varepsilon > 1]$
 θ_ε an ordinal $\in \Theta$
- (c) $\bar{\psi} = \langle \psi_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \zeta \rangle$, where $\psi_\varepsilon < \theta_\varepsilon$
- (d) $\bar{w} = \langle w_{\bar{\varphi}} : \bar{\varphi} \in \Phi \rangle$ where:

$$\Phi =: \bigcup \{ \Phi_\xi : \xi \leq \zeta \}$$

$$\Phi_\xi =: \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \bar{\varphi} : \bar{\varphi} = \langle \varphi_\varepsilon : \xi \leq \varepsilon < \zeta \rangle, \varphi_\varepsilon < \theta_\varepsilon \\ \text{and } \text{dif}(\bar{\psi}, \bar{\varphi}) =: \{ \varepsilon : \xi \leq \varepsilon < \zeta \text{ and } \psi_\varepsilon \neq \varphi_\varepsilon \} \\ \text{is finite} \end{array} \right\}$$

(we can think of $\bar{\varphi} \in \Phi_\xi$ as an alternate history of the condition from time ξ on)

- (e) $\bar{F} = \langle F_{\bar{\varphi}_1, \bar{\varphi}_2} : (\bar{\varphi}_1, \bar{\varphi}_2) \in \Psi \rangle$ where $\Psi = \bigcup_{\xi \leq \zeta} \Psi_\xi$ where

$$\Psi_\xi = \{ (\bar{\varphi}^1, \bar{\varphi}^2) : \bar{\varphi}^1 \in \Phi_\xi, \bar{\varphi}^2 \in \Phi_\xi \text{ and } \bar{\varphi}^1 \restriction [\xi + 1, \zeta) = \bar{\varphi}^2 \restriction [\xi + 1, \zeta) \}.$$

(note: if $k_\varepsilon = 1$ or $\xi = \zeta$, Ψ_ξ has only pairs of the form $(\bar{\varphi}, \bar{\varphi})$ and if $\xi_1 \leq \xi_2 \leq \zeta$, $\bar{\varphi}^2 \in \Phi_{\xi_2}$ then for some $\bar{\varphi}^1 \in \Phi_{\xi_1}$ we have $\bar{\varphi}^2 = \bar{\varphi}^1 \restriction [\xi_1, \zeta)$ such that:

- (f) if $\bar{\varphi}^1, \bar{\varphi}^2 \in \Phi$ and $\bar{\varphi}^1 = \bar{\varphi}^2 \restriction [\xi, \zeta)$ then $w_{\bar{\varphi}^2} \subseteq w_{\bar{\varphi}^1}$ and each $w_{\bar{\varphi}}$ is a subset of α of cardinality $< \kappa$
- (g) if $\bar{\varphi} \in \Phi_0$ and $\xi \leq \zeta$ is a limit ordinal then $w_{\bar{\varphi} \restriction \xi} = \bigcup_{\varepsilon < \xi} w_{\bar{\varphi} \restriction [\varepsilon, \zeta)}$
- (h) if $\bar{\varphi}^1 \in \Phi_{\xi+1}$, $\xi \leq \zeta$, $k_\xi = 2$ then
 $w_{\bar{\varphi}^1} = \bigcup \{ w_{\bar{\varphi}^2} : \bar{\varphi}^2 \in \Phi_\xi \text{ and } \bar{\varphi}^2 \restriction [\xi + 1, \zeta) = \bar{\varphi}^1 \}$

- (i) for $(\bar{\varphi}^1, \bar{\varphi}^2) \in \Psi_\xi$ let $\xi(\bar{\varphi}^1, \bar{\varphi}^2)$ be that (unique) ξ ; for $\bar{\varphi} \in \Phi_\xi$ let $\xi(\bar{\varphi}) = \xi$
- (j) $F_{\bar{\varphi}^1, \bar{\varphi}^2}$ is a function, $\text{Dom}(F_{\bar{\varphi}^1, \bar{\varphi}^2})$ is an initial segment of $w_{\bar{\varphi}^2}$, $\text{Rang}(F_{\bar{\varphi}^1, \bar{\varphi}^2})$ is an initial segment of $w_{\bar{\varphi}^1}$
- (k) $F_{\bar{\varphi}^1, \bar{\varphi}^2}$ is a one to one and order preserving function and $F_{\bar{\varphi}^2, \bar{\varphi}^1} = F_{\bar{\varphi}^1, \bar{\varphi}^2}^{-1}$
- (l) if $(\bar{\varphi}^1, \bar{\varphi}^2) \in \Psi$, $(\bar{\varphi}^2, \bar{\varphi}^3) \in \Psi$ then $F_{\bar{\varphi}^1, \bar{\varphi}^3} \supseteq F_{\bar{\varphi}^1, \bar{\varphi}^2} \circ F_{\bar{\varphi}^2, \bar{\varphi}^3}$, $F_{\bar{\varphi}, \bar{\varphi}} = \text{id}_{w_{\bar{\varphi}}}$ for $\varphi \in \Phi_\xi$
- (m) for $(\bar{\varphi}^1, \bar{\varphi}^2) \in \Psi_\xi$ let $\bar{\varphi}^1 < \bar{\varphi}^2$ means $\varphi_\xi^1 < \varphi_\xi^2$
- (n) if $(\bar{\varphi}^1, \bar{\varphi}^2) \in \Psi_\xi$ and $\bar{\varphi}^1 < \bar{\varphi}^2$ then $\gamma \in \text{Dom}(F_{\bar{\varphi}^1, \bar{\varphi}^2}) \Rightarrow F_{\bar{\varphi}^1, \bar{\varphi}^2}(\gamma) \leq \gamma$
- (o) if $\bar{\varphi} \in \Psi_{\xi+1}$, $k_\xi = 2$, $\gamma < \alpha$ and for at least two $\bar{\varphi}^1 \in \Phi_\xi$ we have $\bar{\varphi}^1 \upharpoonright [\xi+1, \zeta) = \bar{\varphi}$ & $\gamma \in w_{\bar{\varphi}^1}$ then:
 - (α) for every $\bar{\varphi}^1 \in \Phi_\xi$ satisfying $\bar{\varphi}^1 \upharpoonright [\xi+1, \zeta) = \bar{\varphi}$ we have $\gamma \in w_{\bar{\varphi}^1}$
 - (β) if $\bar{\varphi}^1, \bar{\varphi}^2 \in \Phi_\xi$ and $\bar{\varphi}^1 \upharpoonright [\xi+1, \zeta) = \bar{\varphi}^2 \upharpoonright [\xi+1, \zeta) = \bar{\varphi}$ then $F_{\bar{\varphi}^1, \bar{\varphi}^2}(\gamma) = \gamma$ (so is well defined and $\text{otp}(w_{\bar{\varphi}^1} \cap \gamma) = \text{otp}(w_{\bar{\varphi}^2} \cap \gamma)$)
- (p) if $\bar{\varphi} \in \Phi_0$ then $w_{\bar{\varphi}} = \emptyset$
- (q) assume $\bar{\varphi} \in \Phi_{\xi+1}$, $k_\xi = 2$; there is $\mathbf{e}$, a convex² equivalence relation on θ_ξ with finitely many equivalence classes such that:
 - (α) if $\bar{\varphi}^1, \bar{\varphi}^2 \in \Phi_\xi$, $\bar{\varphi}^1 \upharpoonright [\xi+1, \zeta) = \bar{\varphi}^2 \upharpoonright [\xi+1, \zeta)$ and $\varphi_\xi^1, \varphi_\xi^2$ are $\mathbf{e}$ -equivalent then $F_{\bar{\varphi}^1, \bar{\varphi}^2}$ is from $w_{\bar{\varphi}^1}$ onto $w_{\bar{\varphi}^2}$
 - (β) if $(\bar{\varphi}^1, \bar{\varphi}^2) \in \Phi_\xi$, $(\bar{\varphi}^1, \bar{\varphi}^3) \in \Phi_\xi$ (hence $\bar{\varphi}^1, \bar{\varphi}^3 \in \Phi_\xi$) and $\bar{\varphi}^1 \mathbf{e} \bar{\varphi}^2$ then $F_{\bar{\varphi}^1, \bar{\varphi}^3} = F_{\bar{\varphi}^1, \bar{\varphi}^2} \circ F_{\bar{\varphi}^2, \bar{\varphi}^3}$
 (note: if $(\forall \theta \in \Theta)(\theta \leq \omega)$, which is the main case here, $\mathbf{e}$ can be replaced by $n < \omega$, with $\varphi_\xi^1 \mathbf{e} \varphi_\xi^2$ being replaced by $(n \leq \varphi_\xi^1 \ \& \ n \leq \varphi_\xi^2) \vee (\varphi_\xi^1 = \varphi_\xi^2)$.)

1.6 Explanation. The creature u can be thought of as a part of the creation of a condition in Definition 1.11. For $\zeta = 0$ we have an “atomic condition”, we could make it e.g. speaking on one iterand but we have made them empty. If $\zeta = \xi + 1, k_\zeta = 2$ we have θ_ξ conditions forming a Δ -system of conditions of “depth”, “length of history” ξ which we put together. If $\zeta = \xi + 1, k_\zeta = 1$ we extend a condition of depth ξ to satisfy a density requirement on the domain. If ζ is limit, we take a limit of a “nicely increasing sequence of conditions”. Now ψ is the “history”: if we have just put together θ_ξ condition of depth ξ from a Δ -system, it is a “free” choice which one lies on the “main history line” and which are just “alternate histories”. So Φ_ξ is the set of “possible” alternate histories from stage ξ on $w_{\bar{\varphi}}$, and the domain of the condition which was the beginnings of this history and $F_{\bar{\varphi}^1, \bar{\varphi}^2}$ is an isomorphism witnessing our having used a Δ -system. So for $\kappa > \aleph_1$, we shall get even for e.g. $<_{\mathbf{e}}$ (see below) only strategic completeness. Note: we tend to ignore the case $u^{[\bar{\varphi}^1]} = u^{[\bar{\varphi}^2]}$ (see 1.1(7) below), $\bar{\varphi}^1 \neq \bar{\varphi}^2$, anyhow all is preserved.

²the convexity is natural, did not check if necessary

1.7 Definition. 1) Let an α -creature mean an (α, ξ) -creature for some $\xi < \kappa$.

2) Let $\text{CR}_{\alpha, \zeta}$ be the set of (α, ζ) -creatures, $\text{CR}_\alpha = \bigcup_{\zeta < \kappa} \text{CR}_{\alpha, \zeta}$. If $u \in \text{CR}_\alpha$ let

$u = \langle \zeta^u, \bar{k}^u, \bar{\theta}^u, \bar{\psi}^u, \bar{w}^u, \bar{F}^u \rangle$ and $\zeta[u] = \zeta^u$, etc. and let

$\text{Dom}(u) = w^u = w[u] =: w_{< >}^u$; also $\Phi^u, \Phi_\xi^u, \Psi^u, \Psi_\xi^u$ are defined accordingly.

3) For $u_1, u_2 \in \text{CR}_\alpha$ let $u_1 \leq_e u_2$ iff $\zeta[u_1] \leq \zeta[u_2]$, $\bar{k}^{u_1} = \bar{k}^{u_2} \restriction \zeta[u_1]$, $\bar{\theta}^{u_1} = \bar{\theta}^{u_2} \restriction \zeta[u_2]$ and for some $\bar{\varphi}^* \in \Phi_{\zeta[u_1]}^{u_2}$ we have:

- (a) $\bar{\psi}^{u_1} \approx \bar{\psi}^{u_2} \restriction \zeta[u_1]$ i.e. $\{\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \zeta[u_1] \text{ and } \psi_\varepsilon^{u_1} \neq \psi_\varepsilon^{u_2}\}$ is finite
- (b) for $\bar{\varphi} \in \Phi^{u_1}$ we have $w_{\bar{\varphi}}^{u_1} = w_{\bar{\varphi} \cup \bar{\varphi}^*}^{u_2}$
- (c) for $(\bar{\varphi}^1, \bar{\varphi}^2) \in \Psi^{u_1}$ we have $F_{\bar{\varphi}^1, \bar{\varphi}^2}^{u_1} = F_{\bar{\varphi}^1 \cup \bar{\varphi}^*, \bar{\varphi}^2 \cup \bar{\varphi}^*}^{u_2}$.

4) For $u_1, u_2 \in \text{CR}_\alpha$ let $u_1 \leq_{\text{de}} u_2$ iff $u_1 \leq_e u_2$ and $\bar{\psi}^{u_1} = \bar{\psi}^{u_2} \restriction \zeta[u_1]$ so in (3), $\bar{\varphi}^* = \bar{\psi}^{u_2} \restriction [\zeta[u_1], \zeta[u_2]]$.

5) If $u \in \text{CR}_\alpha$ and $\beta \leq \alpha$ we define $u \restriction \beta$ as $\langle \zeta^u, \bar{k}^u, \bar{\theta}^u, \bar{\psi}^u, \bar{w}', \bar{F}' \rangle$, where $\bar{w}' = \langle \bar{w}_\varphi^u \cap \beta : \bar{\varphi} \in \Phi^u \rangle$ and $\bar{F}' = \langle F_{\bar{\varphi}^1, \bar{\varphi}^2}^u \cap (\beta \times \beta) : (\bar{\varphi}^1, \bar{\varphi}^2) \in \Psi^u \rangle$ (see Claim 1.9(1)).

6) For $u_1, u_2 \in \text{CR}_\alpha$ we say $u_1 \approx u_2$ iff $u_1 \leq_e u_2 \leq_e u_1$.

7) If $u \in \text{CR}_{\alpha, \zeta}$, $\xi < \zeta$ and $\bar{\varphi} \in \Phi_\xi^u$ then let $v = u^{[\bar{\varphi}]} \in \text{CR}_{\alpha, \xi}$ be defined by:

$$\zeta^v = \xi$$

$$\bar{k}^v = \bar{k}^u \restriction \xi$$

$$\bar{\theta}^v = \bar{\theta}^u \restriction \xi$$

$$\bar{\psi}^v = \bar{\psi}^u \restriction \xi$$

$$w_{\bar{\varphi}}^v = w_{\bar{\varphi}^1 \cup \bar{\varphi}}^u$$

$$F_{\bar{\varphi}^1, \bar{\varphi}^2}^v = F_{\bar{\varphi}^1 \cup \bar{\varphi}, \bar{\varphi}^2 \cup \bar{\varphi}}^u.$$

8) If $u \in \text{CR}_{\alpha, \zeta}$ and $\xi \leq \zeta^u$ then $v = u^{[\xi]}$ is defined as $u^{[\bar{\psi}^u \restriction \{\xi, \zeta\}]}$.

9) If $u \in \text{CR}_{\alpha, \zeta}$, $\zeta^u = \xi + 1$, $k_\xi^u = 1$ then we let $u^{[*]} = u^{[\xi]}$.

10) If $u \in \text{CR}_{\alpha, \zeta}$, $\zeta^u = \xi + 1$, $k_\xi^u = 2$ then let $\theta^{(u)} = \theta_\xi^u$ and $u^{(i)} = u^{[\{\langle \xi, i \rangle\}]}$ for $i < \theta^{(u)}$ and $F_{(i, j)}^u = F_{\{\langle \xi, i \rangle\}, \{\langle \xi, j \rangle\}}^u$. If $\xi < \zeta^u$, $k_\xi^u = 2$, $i < \theta_\xi^u$ then let $u^{[\xi], (i)} = (u^{[\xi]})^{(i)}$.

11) For $u, v \in \text{CR}_\alpha$ we say that F maps u to v iff: $F \restriction w^u$ is a one to one order preserving function from w^u onto w^v , $\zeta^u = \zeta^v$, $\bar{k}^u = \bar{k}^v$, $\bar{\theta}^u = \bar{\theta}^v$, $\bar{\psi}^u = \bar{\psi}^v$, $w_{\bar{\varphi}}^v = F'' w_{\bar{\varphi}}^u$, $F_{(\bar{\varphi}^1, \bar{\varphi}^2)}^v = F \circ F_{(\bar{\varphi}^1, \bar{\varphi}^2)}^u \circ F^{-1}$ and $F_{(\bar{\varphi}^1, \bar{\varphi}^2)}^u = F^{-1} \circ F_{(\bar{\varphi}^1, \bar{\varphi}^2)}^v \circ F$. We write this $F(u) = v$.

12) For $u \in \text{CR}_{\alpha, \zeta}$, $\zeta \leq \zeta^u$, $\{\bar{\varphi}^1, \bar{\varphi}^2\} \subseteq \Phi_\zeta^u$, we define $F_{\bar{\varphi}^1, \bar{\varphi}^2}^u$, an order preserving function from an initial segment of $\text{Dom}(u^{[\bar{\varphi}^1]})$ onto some initial segment of $\text{Dom}(u^{[\bar{\varphi}^2]})$, by induction on ζ^u :

- (a) if $\zeta = \zeta^u$ then $\bar{\varphi}^1 = \bar{\varphi}^2 = \langle \rangle$ and we let $F_{\bar{\varphi}^1, \bar{\varphi}^2}^u = \text{id}_{\text{Dom}(u)}$
- (b) if $\zeta < \zeta^u = \xi + 1, k_\xi^u = 1$ we let $F_{\bar{\varphi}^1, \bar{\varphi}^2}^u = F_{\bar{\varphi}^1 \upharpoonright [\zeta, \xi), \bar{\varphi}^2 \upharpoonright [\zeta, \xi)}^{u^{[*]}}$
- (c) if $\zeta < \zeta^u = \xi + 1, k_\xi^u = 2$ we let $F_{\bar{\varphi}^1, \bar{\varphi}^2}^u = F_{\bar{\varphi}^1 \upharpoonright [\zeta, \xi), \bar{\varphi}^2 \upharpoonright [\zeta, \xi)}^{u^{[\varphi_\xi^1]}} \circ F_{\varphi_\xi^1, \varphi_\xi^2}^u$
- (d) if $\zeta < \zeta^u, \zeta^u$ a limit ordinal let $F_{\bar{\varphi}^1, \bar{\varphi}^2}^u = F_{\bar{\varphi}^1 \upharpoonright [\zeta, \xi), \bar{\varphi}^2 \upharpoonright [z\eta, \xi)}^{u^{[\xi]}}$ for every $\xi < \zeta^u$ that is large enough such that $\bar{\varphi}^1 \upharpoonright [\xi, \zeta^u] = \bar{\varphi}^2 \upharpoonright [\xi, \zeta^u] = \bar{\psi}^u \upharpoonright [\xi, \zeta^u]$.

1.8 Definition. 1) An α -sequence is $\bar{a} = \langle a_\beta : \beta < \alpha \rangle$ such that $a_\beta \subseteq \beta$. We say $\bar{a}$ is a (μ, α) -sequence if in addition $|\alpha_\beta| < \mu$ for $\beta < \alpha$.
 2) For an α -sequence $\bar{a}$ let $\text{CR}_{\bar{a}, \zeta}$ be the set of $u \in \text{CR}_{\alpha, \zeta}$ such that:

- (*) if $\xi < \zeta^u$ and $k_\xi^u = 2$ and $\theta_\xi^u \geq \omega$ and $(\bar{\varphi}^1, \bar{\varphi}^2) \in \Psi_\xi$ and $\varphi_\xi^1 < \varphi_\xi^2$ then $w_{\bar{\varphi}^2} \cap \bigcup \{a_\beta : \beta \in w_{\bar{\varphi}^1} \cap w_{\bar{\varphi}^2}\} \subseteq w_{\bar{\varphi}^1}$.

In this case, we say u is an $(\bar{a}, \zeta)$ -creature and we say u is an $\bar{a}$ -creature.

1.9 Claim. 1) If u is an (α, ζ) -creature, $\beta \leq \alpha$ then $u \upharpoonright \beta$ (see Definition 1.7(5)) is a (β, ζ) -creature, (and $\zeta[u \upharpoonright \beta] = \zeta[u]$ of course). If $\bar{a}$ is an α -sequence, u is an (α, ζ) -creature, $\beta \leq \alpha$ then $u \upharpoonright \beta$ is an $(\bar{a} \upharpoonright \beta, \zeta)$ -creature. If $\gamma \leq \beta \leq \alpha$ and u is an (α, ζ) -creature then $u \upharpoonright \gamma = (u \upharpoonright \beta) \upharpoonright \gamma$. If u is a (β, ζ) -creature and $\beta \leq \alpha$ then (u is an (α, ζ) -creature and) $u \upharpoonright \beta = u$.

2) If u is an α -creature then for a unique $\zeta = \zeta^u < \kappa$, u is an (α, ζ) -creature.

3) $\leq_e$ is a partial order on $\text{CR}_\alpha, [u_1 \leq_e u_2 \Rightarrow \zeta(u_1) \leq \zeta(u_2)]$ and $[u_1 \leq_e u_2 \ \& \ \zeta[u_1] = \zeta[u_2] \Leftrightarrow u_1 \approx u_2]$ and $[u_1 \leq_e u_2 \Leftrightarrow (\exists \bar{\varphi} \in \Phi^{u_2})(u_1 \approx u_2^{[\bar{\varphi}]})]$ and for an α -sequence $\bar{a}$ we have: $u_1 \leq_e u_2 \ \& \ u_2 \in \text{CR}_{\bar{a}} \Rightarrow u_1 \in \text{CR}_{\bar{a}}$.

4) $\leq_{\text{de}}$ is a partial order on $\text{CR}_\alpha, [u_1 \leq_{\text{de}} u_2 \Rightarrow u_1 \leq_e u_2]$ and $[u_1 \leq_{\text{de}} u_2 \ \& \ \zeta[u_1] = \zeta[u_2] \Rightarrow u_1 = u_2]$ and $[u_1 \leq_{\text{de}} u_2 \Leftrightarrow (\exists \xi \leq \zeta^{u_2})[u_1 = u_2^{[\xi]}]$.

5) $u^{[\xi]}$ is the unique v such that $\zeta^v = \xi \ \& \ v \leq_{\text{de}} u$ (defined iff $\xi \leq \zeta^u$), and for $\xi \leq \varepsilon \leq \zeta^u, (u^{[\varepsilon]})^{[\xi]} = u^{[\xi]}$. Also for $u \in \text{CR}_{\alpha, \zeta}$, if $\xi \leq \zeta$ and $\bar{\varphi} \in \Phi_\xi^u$ then $u^{[\bar{\varphi}]} \in \text{CR}_{\alpha, \xi}$ and $u^{[\bar{\varphi}]} \leq_e u$.

6) On $\text{CR}_\alpha, u \approx u'$ is an equivalence relation (see Definition 1.7(6)).

7) If $u_1 \leq_e u_2$ then for some $u'_2 \approx u_2$ we have $u_1 \leq_{\text{de}} u'_2$.

8) If $u^1 \leq_e u^2$ and $u_1 \leq_e u^1 \upharpoonright \beta$ then for some $u_2 \leq_e u^2$ we have $u_1 = u_2 \upharpoonright \beta$.

9) If $\beta < \alpha$ then $\text{CR}_{\beta, \zeta} \subseteq \text{CR}_{\alpha, \zeta}$ and for any α -sequence $\bar{a}$, $\text{CR}_{\bar{a} \upharpoonright \beta, \zeta} \subseteq \text{CR}_{\bar{a}, \zeta}$.

10) If $u \in \text{CR}_{\alpha, \zeta}, \zeta = \xi + 1, k_\xi^u = 1$ then $u^{(*)} = u^{[\xi]} = u^{[(\xi, 0)]}$.

11) If $u \in \text{CR}_{\alpha, \zeta}, \zeta = \xi + 1, k_\xi^u = 2$ then $\{v^{[\xi]} / \approx : v \approx u\} = \{u^{(i)} / \approx : i < \theta_\xi^u\}$.

12) If $\delta < \kappa$ is a limit ordinal, $\langle u_i : \alpha < \delta \rangle$ is a $\leq_{\text{de}}$ -increasing sequence in CR_α then for one and only one $u \in \text{CR}_\alpha$ we have: $[i < \delta \Rightarrow u_i \leq_{\text{de}} u]$ and $\zeta^u = \bigcup_{i < \delta} \zeta^{u_i}$.

13) For $u \in \text{CR}_\alpha, \xi < \zeta^u$ and $\bar{\varphi}^1, \bar{\varphi}^2, \bar{\varphi}^3 \in \Phi_\xi^u$ we have:

- (i) $F_{\bar{\varphi}^1, \bar{\varphi}^2}^u$ (defined in 1.7(12)) is really a one to one order preserving function from some initial segment of $w_{\bar{\varphi}^2}^u$ onto some initial segment of $w_{\bar{\varphi}^1}^u$
- (ii) $\gamma \in \text{Dom}(F_{\bar{\varphi}^1, \bar{\varphi}^2}^u) \cap \text{Rang}(F_{\bar{\varphi}^1, \bar{\varphi}^2}^u) \Rightarrow F_{\bar{\varphi}^1, \bar{\varphi}^2}^u(\gamma) = \gamma$
- (iii) $F_{\bar{\varphi}^2, \bar{\varphi}^1}^u = (F_{\bar{\varphi}^1, \bar{\varphi}^2}^u)^{-1}$

- (iv) $F_{\bar{\varphi}^1, \bar{\varphi}^3}^u \supseteq F_{\bar{\varphi}^1, \bar{\varphi}^2}^u \circ F_{\bar{\varphi}^2, \bar{\varphi}^3}^u$
- (v) $\text{Dom}(F_{\bar{\varphi}^1, \bar{\varphi}^2}^u) = w_{\bar{\varphi}^2}^u \Leftrightarrow \text{Rang}(F_{\bar{\varphi}^1, \bar{\varphi}^2}^u) = w_{\bar{\varphi}^1}^u$
- (vi) if in (v) the equalities hold then
 $F_{\bar{\varphi}^1, \bar{\varphi}^2}^u(u^{[\bar{\varphi}^2]}) = u^{[\bar{\varphi}^1]}$
- (vii) if in (v) the equalities fail and
 $\gamma_2 = \text{Min}(w_{\bar{\varphi}^2}^u \setminus \text{Dom}(F_{\bar{\varphi}^1, \bar{\varphi}^2}^u))$ and
 $\gamma_1 = \text{Min}(w_{\bar{\varphi}^1}^u \setminus \text{Dom}(F_{\bar{\varphi}^2, \bar{\varphi}^1}^u))$ then $F_{\bar{\varphi}^1, \bar{\varphi}^2}^u(u^{[\bar{\varphi}^2]} \upharpoonright \gamma_2) = u^{[\bar{\varphi}^1]} \upharpoonright \gamma_1$.

14) Assume $u \in CR_{\alpha, \zeta}$, $v \leq_e u$, $u_1 = u^{[\bar{\varphi}]}$, $\bar{\varphi} \in \Phi_{\xi+1}^u$, $k_\xi^u = 2$, $\theta = \theta_\xi^u$,

$v_i = u_1^{(i)} (= u^{[(i) \wedge \bar{\varphi}]})$, see Definition 1.7(10)).

Then there is a convex equivalence relation $\mathbf{e}$ on θ with finitely many equivalence classes such that:

(*) ie^j implies:

- (a) $F_{(i,j)}^{u_1}$ is an order preserving map from $\text{Dom}(v_i)$ onto $\text{Dom}(v_j)$
- (b) $F_{(i,j)}^{u_1}$ maps $\text{Dom}(v) \cap \text{Dom}(v_i)$ onto $\text{Dom}(v) \cap \text{Dom}(v_j)$.

15) If $\gamma \in \text{Dom}(u)$, $u \in CR_\alpha$, then for a unique $\xi < \zeta^u$ we have: $k_\xi = 1$, and $\Phi^{u, \gamma} =: \{\bar{\varphi} \in \Phi_{\xi+1}^u : \gamma \in w_{\bar{\varphi}}^u\}$ is non-empty but $[\bar{\varphi} \in \bigcup_{\varepsilon \leq \xi} \Phi_\varepsilon \Rightarrow \gamma \notin w_{\bar{\varphi}}^u]$ and

$[\bar{\varphi} \in \bigcup_{\varepsilon > \xi} \Phi_\varepsilon^u \Rightarrow (\exists \bar{\varphi}^1)(\bar{\varphi}^1 \in \Phi^{u, \gamma} \ \& \ \bar{\varphi} = \bar{\varphi}^1 \upharpoonright \xi) \text{ and } |a_\gamma| < \kappa \ \& \ \bar{\varphi}^1 \in \Phi^{u, \gamma} \ \& \ \bar{\varphi}^2 \in \Phi^{u, \gamma} \Rightarrow w_{\bar{\varphi}^1}^u \cap a_\gamma = w_{\bar{\varphi}^2}^u \cap a_\gamma]$.

16) Assume $\bar{\varphi} \in \Phi_{\xi+1}^u$, $k_\xi = 2$ and $\bar{\varphi}^1, \bar{\varphi}^2 \in \Phi_\xi^u$, then
 $w_{\bar{\varphi}^1} \cap w_{\bar{\varphi}^2} = \{\gamma : F_{\bar{\varphi}^1, \bar{\varphi}^2}^u(\gamma) = \gamma\} = \text{Dom}(F_{\bar{\varphi}^1, \bar{\varphi}^2}^u) \cap \text{Dom}(F_{\bar{\varphi}^2, \bar{\varphi}^1}^u)$.

Proof. Straightforward, but we elaborate 1), 8) and 14).

1) Reading Definition 1.5, the least trivial clause to check is (q), so assume

$\xi < \zeta^{u \upharpoonright \beta}$, $\bar{\varphi} \in \Phi_{\xi+1}^{u \upharpoonright \beta}$ and $k_\xi^{u \upharpoonright \beta} = 2$. But $\zeta^{u \upharpoonright \beta} = \zeta^u$, $\Phi_{\xi+1}^{u \upharpoonright \beta} = \Phi_{\xi+1}^u$ and $k_\xi^{u \upharpoonright \beta} = k_\xi^u$ and $\theta_\xi^{u \upharpoonright \beta} = \theta_\xi^u$, so as $u \in CR_\alpha$, there is a convex equivalence relation $\mathbf{e}^1$ on θ_ξ^u as required on $\mathbf{e}$ in clause (q) of Definition 1.5 for u . We now define another equivalence relation $\mathbf{e}^2$ on θ_ξ^u ; letting

$$ie^2j \text{ iff } i, j < \theta^{u, ie^1j} \text{ and } (\forall \gamma \in w_{\bar{\varphi} \cup \{\langle \xi, i \rangle\}})[\gamma < \beta \leftrightarrow F_{\bar{\varphi} \cup \{\langle \xi, j \rangle\}, \bar{\varphi} \cup \{\langle \xi, i \rangle\}}^u(\gamma) < \beta].$$

Clearly $\mathbf{e}^2$ is an equivalence relation on θ_ξ^u .

By clause (n) of Definition 1.5 clearly $\mathbf{e}^2$ is convex.

Now if $\mathbf{e}^2$ has infinitely many equivalence classes, let j be minimal such that $\{i/\mathbf{e}^2 : ie^1j\}$ is infinite. Let i_n be the first element in the n -th $\mathbf{e}^2$ -equivalence class $\subseteq j/\mathbf{e}^1$ (or just $i_n < i_{n+1}$, $\neg i_n \mathbf{e}^2 i_{n+1}$, $i_n \mathbf{e}^1 j$) and let $\gamma_n \in w_{\bar{\varphi} \cup \{\langle \xi, i_n \rangle\}}$ witness $\neg i_n \mathbf{e}^2 i_{n+1}$; i.e. $\gamma'_n =: F_{\bar{\varphi} \cup \{\langle \xi, i_{n+1} \rangle\}, \bar{\varphi} \cup \{\langle \xi, i_n \rangle\}}^u(\gamma_n) < \beta \leftrightarrow \gamma_n < \beta$.

Without loss of generality γ_n is minimal under this condition, so by clause (n) of Definition 1.5 as $i_n < i_{n+1}$ we have $\gamma_n < \beta \leq \gamma'_n$, hence necessarily $\gamma_{n+1} < \gamma'_n$ hence $F_{\bar{\varphi} \cup \{\langle \xi, i_n \rangle\}, \bar{\varphi} \cup \{\langle \xi, i_{n+1} \rangle\}}^u(\gamma_{n+1}) < \gamma_n$ (remember that by clause (q)(α) of Definition 1.5, $F_{\bar{\varphi} \cup \{\langle \xi, i_n \rangle\}, \bar{\varphi} \cup \{\langle \xi, i_{n+1} \rangle\}}^u$ is from $w_{\bar{\varphi} \cup \{\langle \xi, i_{n+1} \rangle\}}^u$ onto $w_{\bar{\varphi} \cup \{\langle \xi, i_n \rangle\}}^u$). Hence $\langle F_{\bar{\varphi} \cup \{\langle \xi, i_0 \rangle\}, \bar{\varphi} \cup \{\langle \xi, i_n \rangle\}}^u(\gamma_n) : n < \omega \rangle$ is a strictly decreasing sequence of ordinals; contradiction.

8) Let $\bar{\varphi} \in \Phi^{u^2}$ be such that $u^1 = (u^2)^{[\bar{\varphi}]}$ and let $\bar{\varphi}^1 \in \Phi^{u^1 \upharpoonright \beta}$ be such that $u_1 = (u^1 \upharpoonright \beta)^{[\bar{\varphi}^1]}$ (exists by the definition of $\leq_e$ and the assumptions).

Clearly $\text{Dom}(\bar{\varphi}) = [\zeta^{u^1}, \zeta^{u^2}]$ and $\text{Dom}(\bar{\varphi}^1) = [\zeta^{u_1}, \zeta^{u^1 \upharpoonright \beta}]$. However, $\zeta^{u^1 \upharpoonright \beta} = \zeta^{u^1}$, $\Phi^{u^1 \upharpoonright \beta} = \Phi^{u^1}$ hence $\bar{\varphi}^1 \in \Phi^{u^1}$, so easily $\bar{\varphi}^1 \cup \bar{\varphi} \in \Phi^{u^2}$ and $\text{Dom}(\bar{\varphi}^1 \cup \bar{\varphi}) = [\zeta^{u_1}, \zeta^{u^2}]$, lastly let $u_1 = (u^2)^{[\bar{\varphi}^1 \cup \bar{\varphi}]}$; check.

14) We prove it by induction of ζ^u . Let $\mathbf{e}^1$ be a convex equivalence relation on θ with finitely many equivalence classes which satisfies clause (a) of (*) (exists by clause (q) of Definition 1.5). We will refine it to satisfy clause (b) too.

If $v = u$ the conclusion is immediate: use $\mathbf{e} = \mathbf{e}^1$, so we shall assume $v \neq u$.

Case 1: $\zeta^u = 0$.

Nothing to prove.

Case 2: ζ^u successor.

Subcase 2A: $\zeta[u_1] = \zeta^u$, so $\xi = \zeta^u - 1$.

Let $\bar{\varphi}^1$ be such that $v = u^{[\bar{\varphi}^1]}$, $\bar{\varphi}^1 \in \Phi^u$, note (as $v \neq u$) that necessarily $\text{Dom}(\bar{\varphi}^1) \neq \emptyset$, so $\xi \in \text{Dom}(\bar{\varphi}^1)$ and let $i = \varphi_\xi^1 (< \theta)$ so $v \leq_e u^{(i)}$. Define $\mathbf{e}^2$, an equivalence relation on θ with the classes $\{j : j < i\}, \{i\}, \{j : i < j < \theta\}$ (omitting any occurrence of the empty set). Let $\mathbf{e} = \mathbf{e}^1 \cap \mathbf{e}^2$. By clauses (n), (o), of Definition 1.5 we are done.

Subcase 2B: $\zeta(u_1) < \zeta^u$.

If $k_{\zeta[u]-1}^u = 1$, necessarily $v \leq_e u^{[*]}$ (see Definition 1.7(9)), and $u_1 \leq u^{[*]}$ and $\zeta[u^{[*]}] < \zeta^u$ so we can use the induction hypothesis. So assume $k_{\zeta[u]-1}^u = 2$, hence for some $i^0, i^1 < \theta_{\zeta[u]-1}^u$ we have $v \leq_e u^{(i^0)}, u_1 \leq_e u^{(i^1)}$. If $i^0 = i^1$ as $\zeta[u^{(i^0)}] = \zeta^u - 1$ we can use the induction hypothesis; so assume $i^0 \neq i^1$. Let $v = u^{[\bar{\varphi}^1]}$ so $\varphi_{\zeta[u]-1}^1 = i_0$, let $\bar{\varphi}^2 = \langle \varphi_\zeta^2 : \zeta^v \leq \zeta < \zeta^u \rangle$ be: φ_ζ^2 is φ_ζ^1 if $\zeta \in [\zeta^v, \zeta^u - 1)$, and i^1 if $\zeta = \zeta^u - 1$. Now apply the induction hypothesis with $u^{(i_1)}, u_1, u^{[\bar{\varphi}^2]}$ here standing for u, u_1, v there and get an equivalence relation $\mathbf{e}$. Clearly $F_{(i^1, i^0)}^u$ maps v to $u^{[\bar{\varphi}^2]}$. Is $\mathbf{e}$ as required? So assume $j^1, j^2 < \theta, j_1 \mathbf{e} j_2$ and $\gamma \in \text{Dom}(v) \cap \text{Dom}(u_1^{(j^1)})$; then necessarily $\gamma \in \text{Dom}(u^{(i^0)}) \cap \text{Dom}(u^{(i^1)})$ hence $F_{(i^1, i^0)}^u(\gamma) = \gamma$ (see Definition 1.5 clause (o)) so $\gamma \in \text{Dom}(u^{[\bar{\varphi}^2]})$ hence $\gamma \in \text{Dom}(u^{[\bar{\varphi}^2]}) \cap \text{Dom}(u_1^{(j^1)})$ hence by the choice of $\mathbf{e}$ we have $\gamma \in \text{Dom}(u^{[\bar{\varphi}^2]}) \cap \text{Dom}(u_1^{(j^2)})$ hence $\gamma \in \text{Dom}(u_1^{(j^2)})$ hence $\gamma \in \text{Dom}(v) \cap \text{Dom}(u_1^{(j^2)})$. By the symmetry between j^1 and j^2 this suffices.

Case C: ζ^u is a limit ordinal.

We are assuming $\zeta^v < \zeta^u$ and as ζ^{u_1} is a successor ordinal $\leq \zeta^u$ it is $< \zeta^u$ so for every $\xi < \zeta^u$ be large enough, $v, u_1 \leq_e u^{[\xi]}$, and we can use the induction

hypothesis.

□_{1.9}

* * *

1.10 Definition/Claim. 1) If $\beta \leq \alpha, u_1 \in \text{CR}_\alpha, u_0 =: u_1 \restriction \beta \leq_{\text{de}} u_2 \in \text{CR}_\beta$ we defined $u = u_1 \otimes u_2 \in \text{CR}_\alpha$ as follows. First

$$(a) \quad \zeta^u = \zeta^{u_2}, \bar{k}^u = \bar{k}^{u_2}, \bar{\theta}^u = \bar{\theta}^{u_2} \text{ and } \bar{\psi}^u = \bar{\psi}^{u_2}.$$

Second

(b) $w_{\bar{\varphi}}^u$ is defined as follows:

(i) if $\xi(\bar{\varphi}) \leq \zeta^{u_1}$ and $\bar{\varphi} \restriction [\zeta^{u_1}, \zeta^{u_2}) = \psi^{u_2} \restriction [\zeta^{u_1}, \zeta^{u_2})$ then

$$w_{\bar{\varphi}}^u = w_{\bar{\varphi} \restriction ((\text{Dom } \bar{\varphi}) \cap [0, \zeta^{u_1}))}^{u_1}$$

(ii) if $\xi \in (\zeta^{u_1}, \zeta^{u_2}]$ and $\bar{\varphi} = \psi^{u_2} \restriction [\xi, \zeta^{u_2})$ then

$$w_{\bar{\varphi}}^u = w_{\bar{\varphi}}^{u_2} \cup w^{u_1}$$

(iii) if both cases do not apply then $w_{\bar{\varphi}}^u = w_{\bar{\varphi}}^{u_2}$.

Lastly

(c) $F_{\bar{\varphi}^1, \bar{\varphi}^2}^u$ are defined naturally.

- 2) In part (1), u actually belongs to CR_α and $u \restriction \beta = u_2$ and $u_1 \leq_{\text{de}} u$.
- 3) If $u_1 = u_2 \restriction \beta$ and $\beta' = \cup\{\gamma + 1 : \gamma < \beta \text{ and } \gamma \in \text{Dom}(u_2)\}$ (equivalently $\gamma \in \text{Dom}(u_1)\}$) then $u_1 = u_2 \restriction \beta'$.
- 4) Let $u_1 \leq_{rd} u_2$ means: for some β and u we have $u_1 = u \restriction \beta, u \leq_e u_2$. We call such (β, u) a witnessing pair to $u_1 \leq_{rd} u_2$, and if β is minimal (as in (3)) we call such (β, u) a good witnessing pair in $u_1 \leq_{rd} u_2$.
- 5) $\leq_{rd}$ is partial order (on creatures). In fact, if $u_0 \leq_{rd} u_1 \leq_{rd} u_2$ and (β_ℓ, u'_ℓ) is the witnessing pair for $u_\ell \leq_{rd} u_{\ell+1}$ and $u''_0 \leq_e u'_1$ is such that $u_0 = u''_0 \restriction \beta_0$ (exist by 1.9(8)) then (β_0, u''_0) is the witnessing pair for $u_0 \leq_{rd} u_2$.

Proof. Straightforward.

* * *

We turn to the iteration

1.11 Definition/Lemma. We define and prove the following by induction on α for any α -sequence $\bar{a}$:

(A) We define when $\bar{Q} = \langle P_\beta, Q_\beta : \beta < \alpha \rangle$ is (an iteration) from³ $K^{\bar{a}}$

(B) for $\bar{Q} \in K^{\bar{a}}$ we define the set of elements of

$$P_\alpha = \text{Lim}(\bar{Q}) = \text{Lim}^\alpha(\bar{Q}) = \text{Lim}^{\alpha, \bar{a}}(\bar{Q})$$

³Remark: Note that e.g. $P_\beta * Q_\beta \leq P_{\beta+1}$ is not included, in fact, this does not really interest us. What we want is condition (b) of Conclusion 1.19(1) + 1.20(3).

- (C) for $\mathbf{p} \in P_\alpha$ and $\beta \leq \alpha$ we define $\mathbf{p} \restriction \beta \in P_\beta, u[\mathbf{p}]$ and also $\mathbf{p}^{[u]} \in P_\alpha$ for $u \leq_e u[\mathbf{p}]$ (and show $\mathbf{p} \restriction \beta$ is well defined and in $P_\beta, u[\mathbf{p}]$ is well defined and in CR_α and $\mathbf{p}^{[u]}$ is well defined and in P_α). We also define when $F(\mathbf{p}) = \mathbf{q}$,
- (D) we define the partial order $\leq^{P_\alpha} = \leq_{nr}^{P_\alpha}$ on P_α as well as $\leq_{pr}^{P_\alpha}, \leq_{apr}^{P_\alpha}, \leq_{vpr}^{P_\alpha}$ (we omit the superscript P_α when clear)
- (E) we prove: the relations $\leq^{P_\alpha}, \leq_{pr}^{P_\alpha}, \leq_{vpr}^{P_\alpha}$ and $\leq_{apr}^{P_\alpha}$ are partial orders on P_α and if $\gamma \leq \beta \leq \alpha$ then $P_\gamma \subseteq P_\beta \subseteq \text{Lim}^\alpha(\bar{Q})$ and $\leq^{P_\beta} \restriction P_\gamma = \leq^{P_\gamma}$; similarly for $\leq_{pr}, \leq_{apr}$ and $\leq_{vpr}$; also for $\mathbf{p} \in P_\alpha, \mathbf{p} \restriction \gamma = (\mathbf{p} \restriction \beta) \restriction \gamma$,
 $\mathbf{p} \restriction \gamma \leq_x^{P_\alpha} \mathbf{p} \restriction \beta, [\mathbf{p} \leq_x^{P_\beta} \mathbf{q} \Rightarrow \mathbf{p} \restriction \gamma \leq_x^{P_\gamma} \mathbf{q} \restriction \gamma]$ (for $x \in \{nr, pr, vpr, apr\}$)
and $\mathbf{p} \leq_x^{P_\alpha} \mathbf{q} \Rightarrow \mathbf{p} \leq_y^{P_\alpha} \mathbf{q}$ if
 $(x, y) \in \{(vpr, nr), (pr, nr), (apr, nr), (vpr, pr)\}$
- (F) for $\mathbf{p} \in P_\alpha, \beta \leq \alpha$ and $\mathbf{q}$ such that $\mathbf{p} \restriction \beta \leq \mathbf{q} \in P_\beta$ we define $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{p} \otimes \mathbf{q}$ and prove that $\mathbf{r} \in P_\alpha, \mathbf{p} \leq \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{q} \leq \mathbf{r}$ (in P_α)
- (G) we prove: if for $\gamma < \beta < \alpha$ then $P_\gamma < \circ P_\beta < \circ \text{Lim}^\alpha(\bar{Q})$
- (H) We define when $\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \in P_\alpha$ are strongly compatible, define their canonical common upper bound $\mathbf{r}$ and prove $\mathbf{r} \in P_\alpha$ is a common upper bound of $\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}$ hence prove strongly compatible implies compatible.

Part (A): $\bar{Q} = \langle P_\gamma, Q_\gamma : \gamma < \alpha \rangle$ is from $K^{\bar{a}}$ if:

- (a) each P_β is a forcing notion
- (b) for $\beta < \alpha, Q_\beta$ is a P_β -name of a simple forcing notion (i.e. the description X_{Q_β} is (see Definition 1.1) but for simplicity we assume that $(*)$ holds for all β or $(*)'$ holds for all β where
- (*) the function f_{Q_β}, g_{Q_β} are in V (and even are objects, not just names)
(in order to prove 1.23 for one fixed countable field K only, clearly we can demand that $X_{Q_\beta} \in V$ even is an object not just a P_β -name but in fact the function f, g in 1.2(3) (and $K^*, \mathcal{U}^*$) were chosen so that the proof works even for the “for every countable K ”) and the name of X_{Q_β} involves $< \kappa$ many coordinates only (as in the names in $B(\beta)(c)$);
alternatively
- (*)' more specifically Q_β is Q from 1.4(4)
(we shall work with the $(*)'$ version).
- (c) for $\beta < \alpha$ we have $\bar{Q} \restriction \beta = \langle P_\gamma, Q_\gamma : \gamma < \beta \rangle$ belongs to $K^{\bar{a} \restriction \beta}$
- (d) for $\beta < \alpha, P_\beta = \text{Lim}^\beta(\bar{Q} \restriction \beta)$.

Part (B): Let $\bar{Q} \in K^{\bar{a}}$, we let the set of elements of $P_\alpha = \text{Lim}^\alpha(\bar{Q})$ be defined as follows. Each $\mathbf{p} \in P_\alpha$ will have a depth $\zeta = \zeta(\mathbf{p}) < \kappa$. We define the set of $\mathbf{p} \in P_\alpha$ of depth ζ by induction on ζ . Now $\mathbf{p}$ is a member of P_α of depth ζ if: $\mathbf{p} = \langle p_u : u \leq_e u[\mathbf{p}] \rangle$ (we may write $p_u^{\mathbf{p}}$ or $p_u[\mathbf{p}]$ instead p_u and $u^{\mathbf{p}} =$ instead $u[\mathbf{p}]$) where:

- (α) $u[\mathbf{p}]$ is an $(\bar{a}, \zeta)$ -creature

- (β) each p_u (i.e. for $u \leq_e u[\mathbf{p}]$) has the form
 $(u, \bar{s}, \bar{\mathbf{t}}) = \langle u, \bar{s}^u, \bar{\mathbf{t}}^u \rangle = (u, \bar{s}^{u, \mathbf{p}}, \bar{\mathbf{t}}^{u, \mathbf{p}})$ such that:
- (a) $\bar{s}^u = \langle s_\gamma^u : \gamma \in \text{Dom}(u) \rangle$, s_γ^u is a function with domain
 $n_\gamma = \text{Dom}(s_\gamma^u) \in \omega$ and $\text{Rang}(s_\gamma^u) \subseteq \mathcal{H}(\aleph_0)$
 - (b) $\bar{\mathbf{t}}^u = \langle \mathbf{t}_\gamma^u : \gamma \in \text{Dom}(u) \rangle$, where $\mathbf{t}_\gamma^u = \{t_{\tilde{y}}^{u, \gamma} : y \in Y_\gamma^u\}$; (we shall say
“ $\mathbf{t}_\gamma^u$ finite” instead of “ Y_γ^u is finite”, similarly for $\subseteq$ etc., and demand
 $Y_\gamma^u \subseteq \{\langle \gamma, \xi, n \rangle : n < \omega, \xi < \zeta^u\}$; (clearly $\mathbf{t}_\gamma^u = \emptyset \Leftrightarrow Y_\gamma^u = \emptyset$)
 - (c) each $t_{\tilde{y}}^{u, \gamma}$ is a P_γ -name of a member of ${}^\omega \omega$ (but s_γ^u, Y_γ^u are not names!).
Moreover, there is a $v = v(t_{\tilde{y}}^{u, \gamma}, \mathbf{p}) \leq_e u$ (not depending on u) and for
each $k < \omega$ there is a set
 $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}_{y, k}^{u, \gamma} \subseteq \mathcal{I}[u] =: \{\mathbf{r} : \mathbf{r} \in P_\gamma, u[\mathbf{r}] \leq_e v \upharpoonright \gamma\}$, each element of $\mathcal{I}$
forcing a value to $t_{\tilde{y}}^{u, \gamma}(k)$ such that every $\mathbf{q} \in P_\gamma$ with $u \leq_e u[\mathbf{q}]$ is
compatible with some $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{I}$ and we even demand strongly compatible
(see part (H)), note we use it to P_γ ; i.e. to $\bar{Q} \upharpoonright \gamma$)
 - (d) Moreover, if a_γ has cardinality $\geq \kappa$, then $\mathbf{t}_\gamma^u$ is finite and
 $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{I}_{y, k}^{u, \gamma} \Rightarrow u[\mathbf{r}] \subseteq a_\gamma$ (we could be more specific here).

We further require:

- (γ)(a) if $u_1 \leq_e u_2 \leq_e u[\mathbf{p}]$ then
 $\bar{s}^{u_1} = \bar{s}^{u_2} \upharpoonright (\text{Dom } u_1)$ (not required from $\bar{\mathbf{t}}!$)⁴
(so $s_\alpha^{u, \mathbf{p}}$ can be written $s_\alpha^{\mathbf{p}}$)
- (b) if $u_1 \approx u_2 \leq_e u[\mathbf{p}]$ then
 $\bar{\mathbf{t}}^{u_1} = \bar{\mathbf{t}}^{u_2}$
- (c) if $u_1, u_2 \leq_e u[\mathbf{p}]$, $\beta < \alpha$, $u_1 \upharpoonright \beta = u_2 \upharpoonright \beta$ (hence $\zeta[u_1] = \zeta[u_2]$, etc.) then
 $\bar{\mathbf{t}}^{u_1} \upharpoonright \beta = \bar{\mathbf{t}}^{u_2} \upharpoonright \beta$ (for $\bar{s}$ this follows from the stronger conditions (γ)(a)).
- (δ)(a) If $u \leq_e u[\mathbf{p}]$ and $\zeta^u = \xi + 1$ and $k_\xi^u = 1, v = u^{[\xi]}$ then:
- (i) $\bar{s}^v = \bar{s}^u \upharpoonright (\text{Dom } v)$, (follows from (γ)(a))
 - (ii) for $\gamma \in \text{Dom}(v)$ we have $\mathbf{t}_\gamma^v \subseteq \mathbf{t}_\gamma^u$ and equality holds for all but finitely
many γ 's
[we need the non-equal case e.g. for $t \in \mathbf{t}_\gamma^u$ whose name is not “based on v ”,
see conditions (β)(b), (c) above]
 - (iii) for $\gamma \in \text{Dom}(v)$ we have $\mathbf{t}_\gamma^u \setminus \mathbf{t}_\gamma^v$ is finite
 - (iv) if $\gamma \in \text{Dom}(v)$ and a_γ has cardinality $< \kappa$ then $\mathbf{t}_\gamma^u = \mathbf{t}_\gamma^v$
 - (v) $\{\zeta : \zeta \in \text{Dom}(u) \setminus \text{Dom}(u^{[\xi]}) \text{ and } s_\gamma^u \neq \emptyset \text{ or } \mathbf{t}_\gamma^u \neq \emptyset\}$ is finite and for
 $\gamma \in \text{Dom}(u) \setminus \text{Dom}(u^{[\xi]})$, Y_γ^u is finite.
- (b) If $\zeta^u = \xi + 1$ and $u \leq_e u[\mathbf{p}]$, $k_\xi^u = 2$, $\bar{\varphi} \in \Phi_{\zeta[u]}^{u[\mathbf{p}]}$ and $u = u[\mathbf{p}]^{\bar{\varphi}}$ and for
 $i < \theta =: \theta_\xi^{u[\mathbf{p}]}$ we let $v_i = u^{(i)}$ (see Definition 1.7(10)) then:

- (i) for $i < \theta$ and $\gamma \in \text{Dom}(v_i) \setminus \bigcup_{j < \theta, j \neq i} \text{Dom}(v_j)$ we have:

$$\mathbf{t}_\gamma^{v_i} = \mathbf{t}_\gamma^u$$

⁴Why the asymmetry? Because given a Δ -system building a bound to $\aleph_0$ of them, for a specific coordinate γ , all of the conditions contribute the same s but not necessarily the same $\mathbf{t}$.

(ii) for $\gamma \in \bigcap_{i < \theta} \text{Dom}(v_i)$ (note condition (o) of Definition 1.5) we have

$$\bigcup_{i < \theta} \mathbf{t}_\gamma^{v_i} = \mathbf{t}_\gamma^u$$

(iii) for some convex equivalence relation $\mathbf{e} = \mathbf{e}_u^{\mathbf{p}} = \mathbf{e}[\mathbf{p}, u]$ on θ with finitely many equivalence classes we have:
 for $i < j < \theta$ which are $\mathbf{e}$ -equivalent, $F_{(i,j)}^u$ maps $\mathbf{p}^{[v_i]}$ to $\mathbf{p}^{[v_j]}$
 (where $\mathbf{p}^{[u]}, F(p^{[u]})$ are defined in Part (C) below).

(c) If ζ^u is a limit ordinal then for some $\xi < \zeta^u$ we have:

(i) $\gamma \in \text{Dom}(u) \setminus \text{Dom}(u^{[\xi]}) \Rightarrow s_\gamma^u = \emptyset \ \& \ \mathbf{t}_\gamma^u = \emptyset$

(ii) $\gamma \in \text{Dom}(u^{[\xi]}) \Rightarrow \mathbf{t}_\gamma^u = \mathbf{t}_\gamma^{u^{[\xi]}}$.

Part (C): Let $\mathbf{p} \in P_\alpha (= \text{Lim}^\alpha(\bar{Q}))$. For $u^* \leq_e u[\mathbf{p}]$, we define $\mathbf{p}^{[u^*]} =: \langle p_v : v \leq_e u^* \rangle$ (so $u[\mathbf{p}^{[u^*]}] = u^*$). It is easy to check that $\mathbf{p}^{[u^*]} \in P_\alpha$. Let $\beta \leq \alpha$, we shall define $\mathbf{q} =: \mathbf{p} \restriction \beta$ and prove that $\mathbf{q} \restriction \beta \in P_\beta$. If $\beta = \alpha$ let $\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{p}$, so assume $\beta < \alpha$. Let $\mathbf{p} = \langle p_u : u \leq_e u[\mathbf{p}] \rangle$, $p_u = \langle u, \bar{s}^u, \bar{\mathbf{t}}^u \rangle$; we let $u[\mathbf{q}]$ be $u[\mathbf{p}] \restriction \beta$ (see Definition 1.7(5)) and $\mathbf{q} = \langle q_u : u \leq_e u[\mathbf{q}] \rangle$ where: if $u \leq_e u[\mathbf{q}]$, $u = v \restriction \beta$ and $v \leq_e u[\mathbf{p}]$ then $q_u = \langle u, \bar{s}^v \restriction \text{Dom}(u), \bar{\mathbf{t}}^v \restriction \text{Dom}(u) \rangle$. Now we have to prove various things.

Fact: q_u is defined in at most one way.

[Why? If $v', v'' \leq u[\mathbf{p}]$ and $v' \restriction \beta = v'' \restriction \beta$ then $(v' \restriction \beta, \bar{s}^{v'} \restriction \beta, \bar{\mathbf{t}}^{v'} \restriction \beta) = (v'' \restriction \beta, \bar{s}^{v''} \restriction \beta, \bar{\mathbf{t}}^{v''} \restriction \beta)$; why? first coordinate by assumption, second coordinate by clause $(\gamma)(a)$ of Part (B) and third coordinate by clause $(\gamma)(c)$ of Part (B)].

Fact: Each q_u (for $u \leq_e u[\mathbf{q}]$) is defined at least once.

[Why? Just use 1.9(8)].

Fact: $\mathbf{q} \in P_\beta$.

[Why? We can check all the conditions].

Let $F(\mathbf{p}) = \mathbf{q}$ if $\text{Dom}(F)$ include $\text{Dom}(u^{\mathbf{p}})$ and $F(u^{\mathbf{p}}) = u^{\mathbf{q}}$ (see 1.7(11) and $F(p_u^{\mathbf{p}}) = p_{F(u)}^{\mathbf{q}}$ which means: for every $\alpha \in \text{Dom}(u^{\mathbf{p}})$ we have $s_\alpha^{\mathbf{p}} = s_{F(\alpha)}^{\mathbf{q}}$ and similarly with $\mathbf{t}$).

Part (D): We define the partial orders (i.e. binary relations which we shall prove are partial orders) $\leq = \leq_{nr}, \leq_{pr}, \leq_{vpr}$ and $\leq_{apr}$ on P_α

(α) $\mathbf{p}^0 \leq_{pr} \mathbf{p}^1$ where $\mathbf{p}^\ell = \langle p_u^\ell : u \leq_e u[\mathbf{p}^\ell] \rangle$ (so $p_u^\ell = (u, \bar{s}^{u, \mathbf{p}^\ell}, \bar{\mathbf{t}}^{u, \mathbf{p}^\ell})$) holds iff for some $u \leq_e u[\mathbf{p}^1]$ and $\beta \leq \alpha$ we have:

(a) $u[\mathbf{p}^0] = u \restriction \beta$,

(b) $\bigwedge_{v \leq_e u} \bar{s}^{v \restriction \beta, \mathbf{p}^0} = \bar{s}^{v, \mathbf{p}^1} \restriction \beta$ and

(c) $\bigwedge_{v \leq_e u} \bar{\mathbf{t}}^{v \restriction \beta, \mathbf{p}^0} = \bar{\mathbf{t}}^{v, \mathbf{p}^1} \restriction \beta$

- (β) $\mathbf{p}^0 \leq_{vpr} \mathbf{p}^1$ if in (α), $u \leq_{de} u[\mathbf{p}^0]$ and
 $\gamma \in \text{Dom}(u[\mathbf{p}^1]) \setminus \text{Dom}(u[\mathbf{p}^0]) \Rightarrow s_\gamma^{u[\mathbf{p}^1], \mathbf{p}^1} = \emptyset \ \& \ t_\gamma^{u[\mathbf{p}^1], \mathbf{p}^1} = \emptyset$
(of course by clause (α) we have
 $\beta \in u[\mathbf{p}^0] \Rightarrow (s_\beta^{\mathbf{p}^1}, t_\beta^{u[\mathbf{p}^1], \mathbf{p}^1}) = (s_\beta^{\mathbf{p}^1}, t_\beta^{u[\mathbf{p}^0], \mathbf{p}^0})$)
- (γ) $\mathbf{p}^0 \leq_{apr} \mathbf{p}^1$ where $\mathbf{p}^\ell = \langle p_u^\ell : u \leq_e u[\mathbf{p}^\ell] \rangle$
so $p_u^\ell = (u, \bar{s}^{u, \mathbf{p}^\ell}, \bar{t}^{u, \mathbf{p}^\ell})$ holds iff:
- (a) $u[\mathbf{p}^0] \approx u[\mathbf{p}^1]$
 - (b) for every $u \leq_e u[\mathbf{p}^1]$ and $\gamma \in \text{Dom}(u)$, we have $s_\gamma^{u, \mathbf{p}^0} \subseteq s_\gamma^{u, \mathbf{p}^1}$
and $t_\gamma^{u, \mathbf{p}^0} \subseteq t_\gamma^{u, \mathbf{p}^1}$
 - (c) for every $\gamma \in \text{Dom}(u[\mathbf{p}^0])$ we have (see Definition 1.1(2)):

$$\mathbf{p}^1 \restriction \gamma \Vdash_{P_\gamma} "Q_\gamma \models (s_\gamma^{u[\mathbf{p}^0], \mathbf{p}^0}, t_\gamma^{u[\mathbf{p}^0], \mathbf{p}^0}) \leq (s_\gamma^{u[\mathbf{p}^1], \mathbf{p}^1}, t_\gamma^{u[\mathbf{p}^1], \mathbf{p}^1})"$$

(Note: this trivially holds if $s_\gamma^{u[\mathbf{p}^0], \mathbf{p}^0} = s_\gamma^{u[\mathbf{p}^1], \mathbf{p}^1}$ or if
 $s_\gamma^{u[\mathbf{p}^0], \mathbf{p}^0} \subseteq s_\gamma^{u[\mathbf{p}^1], \mathbf{p}^1} \ \& \ t_\gamma^{u[\mathbf{p}^0], \mathbf{p}^0} = \emptyset$)

- (d) if in clause (c) the set a_γ is of cardinality $< \kappa$ then we moreover have:
if $t \in t_\gamma^{u[\mathbf{p}^0], \mathbf{p}^0}$ then $(\mathbf{p}^1)^{[t, \mathbf{p}^0]}$ force a value to $t(n)$ whenever
 $n \in \text{Dom}(s_\gamma^{u[\mathbf{p}^1], \mathbf{p}^1}) \setminus \text{Dom}(s_\gamma^{u[\mathbf{p}^0], \mathbf{p}^0})$.
Moreover for any such n , if $s_\gamma^{u[\mathbf{p}^1], \mathbf{p}^1}(n) \neq 0$ then it is computed
by $g_{Q_\gamma}(\in V)$ from $s_\gamma^{u[\mathbf{p}^1], \mathbf{p}^1} \restriction n$ and the values above.

- (δ) Now let $P_\alpha \models " \mathbf{p} \leq \mathbf{r} "$ iff for some $\mathbf{q} \in P_\alpha$ we have
 $P_\beta \models " \mathbf{p} \leq_{pr} \mathbf{q} "$, and $P_\alpha \models " \mathbf{q} \leq_{apr} \mathbf{r} "$
- (ε) $\mathbf{p}^0 \approx \mathbf{p}^1$ means $u[\mathbf{p}^0] \approx u[\mathbf{p}^1]$
and $u \leq_e u[\mathbf{p}^1] \Rightarrow \mathbf{p}_u^0 = \mathbf{p}_u^1$.

Part E:

- (α) $\mathbf{p} \leq_x \mathbf{p}$ if $x \in \{nr, vpr, pr, apr\}$
[why? check]
- (β) if $\mathbf{p} \leq_{pr} \mathbf{q}$ and (β, u) is as in clause (α) of Part (D) then $u[\mathbf{p}] \leq_{rd} u[\mathbf{q}]$
hence $\text{Dom}(u[\mathbf{p}]) \subseteq \text{Dom}(u[\mathbf{q}])$, moreover (β, u) is a witnessing pair for
 $u[\mathbf{p}] \leq_{rd} u[\mathbf{q}]$ and if β is as in 1.10(3), even a good witnessing pair and we
say the pair witnesses $\mathbf{p} \leq_{pr} \mathbf{q}$.
[why? check].
- (γ) if $\mathbf{p}_\ell \leq_{pr} \mathbf{q}$ is witnessed by (β, u) for $\ell = 0, 1$ then $\mathbf{p}_0 = \mathbf{p}_1$
[why? read the definitions]
- (δ) if $\mathbf{p}_0 \leq_{pr} \mathbf{p}_1 \leq_{pr} \mathbf{p}_2$ then $\mathbf{p}_0 \leq_{pr} \mathbf{p}_1$
[why? let (β_ℓ, u_ℓ) witness $\mathbf{p}_\ell \leq_{pr} \mathbf{p}_{\ell+1}$ for $\ell = 0, 1$, so by 1.10 we know some
 (β'_0, u'_0) witness $u[\mathbf{p}_0] \leq_{rd} u[\mathbf{p}_2]$ and check that it witnesses $\mathbf{p}_0 \leq_{pr} \mathbf{p}_1$]
- (ε) if $\mathbf{p}_0 \leq_{vpr} \mathbf{q}$ then $\mathbf{p}_0 \leq_{pr} \mathbf{q}$
[why? demanded in the definition]
- (ζ) if $\mathbf{p}^0 \leq_{vpr} \mathbf{p}^1 \leq_{vpr} \mathbf{p}^2$ then $\mathbf{p}_0 \leq_{vpr} \mathbf{p}_2$
[why? as $\text{Dom}(u[\mathbf{p}^0]) \subseteq \text{Dom}(u[\mathbf{p}^1]) \subseteq \text{Dom}(u[\mathbf{p}^2])$, and if

- $\gamma \in \text{Dom}(u[\mathbf{p}^2]) \setminus \text{Dom}(u[\mathbf{p}^0])$ then for some $\ell \in \{0, 1\}$ we have
 $\gamma \in \text{Dom}(u[\mathbf{p}^{\ell+1}]) \setminus \text{Dom}(u[\mathbf{p}^\ell])$ hence $s_\gamma^{u[\mathbf{p}^2], \mathbf{p}^2} = s_\gamma^{u[\mathbf{p}^{\ell+1}], \mathbf{p}^\ell} = \emptyset$
(as $\mathbf{p}^\ell \leq_{vpr} \mathbf{p}_{\ell+1}$) and similarly $\mathbf{t}_\gamma^{u[\mathbf{p}^2], \mathbf{p}^2} = \mathbf{t}_\gamma^{u[\mathbf{p}^{\ell+1}], \mathbf{p}^{\ell+1}} = \emptyset$
- (η) if $\beta < \alpha$ and $\mathbf{p} \leq_* \mathbf{q}$ then in $P_\gamma, \mathbf{p} \upharpoonright \beta \leq_x \mathbf{q} \upharpoonright \beta$
[why? check]
- (θ) if $\mathbf{p}^0 \leq_{apr} \mathbf{p}^1 \leq_{apr} \mathbf{p}^2$ then $\mathbf{p}^0 \leq_{apr} \mathbf{p}^2$
[why? straightforward; for clause (c) note by clause (η) that
 $P_\gamma \models \text{"}\mathbf{p}^0 \upharpoonright \gamma \leq \mathbf{p}^1 \upharpoonright \gamma \leq \mathbf{p}^2 \upharpoonright \gamma\text{"}$]
- (ι) if $u \leq_\ell u[\mathbf{p}]$ and $\mathbf{p} \in P_\alpha$ and $\beta \leq \alpha$ then
 $\mathbf{p}^{[u]} \upharpoonright \beta \leq_{pr} \mathbf{p}$ as witnessed by (β, u)
- (κ) if $\mathbf{p}^0 \leq_{apr} \mathbf{p}^1 \leq_{pr} \mathbf{p}^2$ then for some $\mathbf{q}$ we have $\mathbf{p}^0 \leq_{pr} \mathbf{q} \leq_{apr} \mathbf{p}^2$.
Why? Let (β^*, u^*) be a good witness to $\mathbf{p}^1 \leq_{pr} \mathbf{p}$.
We define $\mathbf{q}$ as follows:

- (a) $u[\mathbf{q}] = u[\mathbf{p}^2]$
- (b) $s_\gamma^{u[\mathbf{q}], \mathbf{q}}$ is: $s_\gamma^{u[\mathbf{p}^2], \mathbf{p}^2}$ if $\gamma \in \text{Dom}(u[\mathbf{p}^2]) \setminus \text{Dom}(u[\mathbf{p}^1])$
 $s_\gamma^{u[\mathbf{p}^0], \mathbf{p}^0}$ if $\gamma \in \text{Dom}(u[\mathbf{p}^1])$
- (c) $s_\gamma^{u, \mathbf{q}}$ for $u \leq_e u[\mathbf{q}]$ is $s_\gamma^{u[\mathbf{q}], \mathbf{q}}$
- (d) $\mathbf{t}_\gamma^{u, \mathbf{q}}$ for $\gamma \in \text{Dom}(u), u \leq_e u[\mathbf{q}]$ is:
 $\mathbf{t}_\gamma^{u \upharpoonright \beta^*, \mathbf{p}^0}$ if $\gamma \in \text{Dom}(u[\mathbf{p}_0])$ & $u \upharpoonright \beta^* \leq_e u[\mathbf{p}_0]$
 $\mathbf{t}_\gamma^{u, \mathbf{p}}$ if otherwise.

We now have to prove that $\mathbf{q}$ is as required.

$\mathbf{q} \in P_\alpha$: That is we have to check the definition in Part B.

Almost all clauses of Part B are obvious, but we have to say something on
(δ)(b)(iii) hence the definition of $s_\gamma^{u, \mathbf{q}}$. So let $u \leq_e u[\mathbf{q}], \zeta^u = \xi + 1, k_\xi^u = 2, u = u[\mathbf{q}]^{[\bar{\varphi}]}$ where $\bar{\varphi} \in \Phi_{\zeta[u]}^{u[\mathbf{q}]}$ and for $i < \theta =: \theta_\xi^{u[\mathbf{q}]}$ we let $v_i = u^{(i)}$. So as $u[\mathbf{q}] = u[\mathbf{p}^2]$ we can replace $\mathbf{q}$ by $\mathbf{p}_2$ and so there is a convex equivalence relation $\mathbf{e}$ on θ such that $i\mathbf{e}j \Rightarrow F_{\langle j \rangle \sim \bar{\varphi}, \langle i \rangle \sim \bar{\varphi}}^u$ maps $(\mathbf{p}^2)^{[v_i]}$ to $(\mathbf{p}^2)^{[v_j]}$. Does $\mathbf{e}$ “work” for the $q^{[v_i]}$? The problem is with the $s_\gamma^{v_i, \mathbf{q}}$ ’s and it works by 1.9(13).

$\mathbf{p}^0 \leq_{pr} \mathbf{q}$ Straightforward.

$\mathbf{q} \leq_{apr} \mathbf{p}^2$ Straightforward.

(Compare with 1.14(1))

- (λ) $\leq^{P_\alpha}$ is a partial order.
[why? follows by clause (κ) as $\leq_{pr}^{P_\alpha}, \leq_{apr}^{P_\alpha}$ are transitive]
- (μ) if $\beta_1, \beta_2 \leq \alpha, p \in P_\alpha$ then $(\mathbf{p} \upharpoonright \beta_1) \upharpoonright \beta_2 = \mathbf{p} \upharpoonright (\text{Min}\{\beta_1, \beta_2\})$
[check]
- (ν) $u[\mathbf{p} \upharpoonright \beta] = u[\mathbf{p}] \upharpoonright \beta$
[why? check]
- (ξ) for $\beta \leq \alpha, x \in \{nr, pr, apr, vpr\}$, we have $\leq_x^{P_\alpha} \upharpoonright P_\beta = \leq_x^{P_\beta}$
[why? read the definitions]

- (o) if $\alpha^* \leq \alpha$ and $\mathbf{p} \leq_{pr}^{P_\alpha} \mathbf{q}$ then $(\mathbf{p} \restriction \alpha^*) \leq_{pr}^{P_\alpha} (\mathbf{q} \restriction \alpha^*)$
 [why? let $\beta \leq \alpha$ and u be as in Part (D) clause (a), witnessing $\mathbf{p} \leq_{pr}^{P_\alpha} \mathbf{q}$,
 let $\beta^* = \min\{\beta, \alpha^*\}$, so it suffices to prove that $\beta^*, u \restriction \alpha^*$ witness
 $(\mathbf{p} \restriction \alpha^*) \leq_{pr}^{P_\alpha} (\mathbf{q} \restriction \alpha^*)$, and we have to check (a),(b),(c) of (a) of Part (D).]

Clause (a): $u[\mathbf{p} \restriction \alpha^*] = u[\mathbf{p}] \restriction \alpha^* = (u[\mathbf{q} \restriction \beta]) \restriction \alpha^* = u[(\mathbf{q} \restriction \beta) \restriction \alpha^*],$
 $u[\mathbf{q} \restriction \min\{\beta, \alpha^*\}] = u[(\mathbf{q} \restriction \alpha^*) \restriction \beta^*] = u[\mathbf{q} \restriction \alpha^*] \restriction \beta^*.$

Clause (b),(c): Check.

- (π) if $\alpha^* \leq \alpha$ and $\mathbf{p} \leq_{vpr}^{P_\alpha} \mathbf{q}$ then $(\mathbf{p} \restriction \alpha^*) \leq_{vpr}^{P_\alpha} (\mathbf{q} \restriction \alpha^*)$
 [why? easy].
 (ρ) if $\alpha^* \leq \alpha$ and $\mathbf{p} \leq_{apr}^{P_\alpha} \mathbf{q}$ then $(\mathbf{p} \restriction \alpha^*) \leq_{apr}^{P_\alpha} (\mathbf{q} \restriction \alpha^*)$
 [why? think].
 (ξ) if $\alpha^* \leq \alpha$ then $\mathbf{p} \restriction \alpha^* \leq_{pr} \mathbf{p}$
 [why? check].

Part (F): If $\mathbf{p} \in P_\alpha, \beta \leq \alpha, \mathbf{p} \restriction \beta \leq \mathbf{q} \in P_\beta$ then we shall define $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{p} \otimes \mathbf{q}$ and prove $\mathbf{r} \in P_\alpha, \mathbf{p} \leq \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{q} \leq \mathbf{r}$. The definition of $\mathbf{r}$ is as follows:

- (α) $u[\mathbf{p}] \leq_{de} u[\mathbf{r}] = u[\mathbf{p}] \otimes u[\mathbf{q}]$
 (see 1.10)
 (β) $\bar{s}^{u[\mathbf{r}], \mathbf{r}} \restriction (\text{Dom}(u[\mathbf{p}]) \setminus \text{Dom}(u[\mathbf{q}])) \subseteq \bar{s}^{u[\mathbf{p}], \mathbf{p}}$
 (γ) $\bar{s}^{u[\mathbf{r}], \mathbf{r}} \restriction \text{Dom}(u[\mathbf{q}]) = \bar{s}^{u[\mathbf{q}], \mathbf{q}}$
 (δ) $u \leq_e u[\mathbf{r}] \Rightarrow \mathbf{t}^{u, \mathbf{r}} \restriction \beta = \mathbf{t}^{u \restriction \beta, \mathbf{q}}$
 (ε) $u \leq_e u^{\mathbf{p}} \ \& \ \gamma \in \text{Dom}(u) \setminus \beta \Rightarrow \mathbf{t}_\gamma^{u, \mathbf{r}} = \mathbf{t}_\gamma^{u, \mathbf{p}}$
 (ζ) $u^{\mathbf{p}} \leq_e u \leq_e u[\mathbf{r}] \ \& \ \gamma \in \text{Dom}(u) \setminus \text{Dom}(u[\mathbf{q}]) \Rightarrow \mathbf{t}_\gamma^{u, \mathbf{r}} = \mathbf{t}_\gamma^{[u[\mathbf{p}], \mathbf{p}]}$.

Let $u^* \approx u[\mathbf{q}]$ be such that $u[\mathbf{p} \restriction \beta] \leq_{de} u^*$ (exists by 1.9(7)). Clearly $\zeta[u[\mathbf{p}]] \leq \zeta[u^*]$; for $\xi \leq \zeta[u^*]$ let u_ξ be $(u^*)^{[\xi]}$. Let $\zeta^0 = \zeta[u[\mathbf{p}]]$ and $\zeta^1 = \zeta[u^*]$. We now define by induction on $\zeta \in [\zeta^0, \zeta^1]$, a condition $\mathbf{r}_\zeta$ with $u[\mathbf{r}_\zeta] = u_\zeta$ such that $\mathbf{r}_\zeta \restriction \beta = \langle q_u : u \leq_e u_\zeta \rangle$, and $\mathbf{r}_{\zeta_0} = \mathbf{p} \restriction \beta$. There is no problem, (remembering (a)(b) of part (B).)

Part (G): For $\gamma \leq \beta < \alpha, P_\gamma \leq \circ P_\beta \leq \circ P_\alpha$. Follows by parts (E),(F).

Part (H): We define: $\mathbf{p}^1, \mathbf{p}^2 \in P_\alpha$ are strongly compatible (inside u) if

- (a) for $\ell < 2$ we have $u^\ell \leq_e u \in \text{CR}_\alpha, \mathbf{p}^\ell \in P_\alpha$ and $u[\mathbf{p}^\ell] = u^\ell$
 (b) if $\gamma \in \text{Dom}(u_0) \cap \text{Dom}(u_1)$ and $s_\gamma^{u^1, \mathbf{p}^0} \neq s_\gamma^{u^2, \mathbf{p}^1}$ then for some $\ell \in \{1, 2\}$ we have $\mathbf{t}_\gamma^{u^\ell, \mathbf{p}^\ell} = \emptyset = s_\gamma^{u^\ell, \mathbf{p}^\ell}$ or at least $\mathbf{t}_\gamma^{u^\ell, \mathbf{p}^\ell} = \emptyset \ \& \ s_\gamma^{u^\ell, \mathbf{p}^\ell} \subseteq s_\gamma^{u^{2-\ell}, \mathbf{p}^{2-\ell}}.$

Define $\mathbf{q}$ and their canonical common upper bound by:

$$u[\mathbf{q}] = u, \mathbf{q} = \langle q_v : v \leq_e u \rangle$$

$$s_\gamma^{v, \mathbf{q}} = s_\gamma^{u^0, \mathbf{p}^0} \cup s_\gamma^{u^1, \mathbf{p}^1}$$

$$\mathbf{t}_\gamma^{v,\mathbf{q}} = \mathbf{t}_\gamma^{u^0,\mathbf{p}^0} \cup \mathbf{t}_\gamma^{u^1,\mathbf{p}^1}.$$

Fact: $\mathbf{q}$ actually is a common upper bound of $\mathbf{p}^0, \mathbf{p}^1$. $\square_{1.11}$

Some properties of those partial orders:

1.12 Claim. 1) If $\mathbf{p} \in P_\alpha$ then $[u \approx u[\mathbf{p}] \Rightarrow \mathbf{p}^{[u]} \cong \mathbf{p}]$ and $[u \leq_e u[\mathbf{p}] \Rightarrow \mathbf{p}^{[u]} \leq \mathbf{p}]$ moreover $[u \leq_e u[\mathbf{p}] \Rightarrow \mathbf{p}^{[u]} \leq_{pr} \mathbf{p}]$.

2) If $\mathbf{p}^1, \mathbf{p}^2 \in P_\alpha, u[\mathbf{p}^1] \approx u[\mathbf{p}^2]$ and $[u \leq_e u[\mathbf{p}^1] \Rightarrow p_u^1 = p_u^2]$ then $\bar{\mathbf{p}}^1 \leq_{apr} \mathbf{p}^2 \leq_{apr} \mathbf{p}^1$; i.e. $\bar{\mathbf{p}}^1 \approx \mathbf{p}^2$.

3) $(P_\alpha, \leq_{vpr})$ is κ -complete, in fact any $\leq_{vpr}$ -increasing sequences of length $\delta < \kappa$ has a lub.

4) If $P_\alpha \models \text{"}\mathbf{p} \leq_{apr} \mathbf{q}\text{"}$, $\beta < \alpha$ and $\mathbf{r}$ is defined by: $u[\mathbf{r}] = u[\mathbf{q}]$, $r_u = \langle u, \bar{s}^{u,\mathbf{q}} \upharpoonright \beta \cup \bar{s}^{u,\mathbf{p}} \upharpoonright [\beta, \alpha], \bar{\mathbf{t}}^{u,\mathbf{q}} \upharpoonright \beta \cup \bar{\mathbf{t}}^{u,\mathbf{p}} \upharpoonright [\beta, \alpha] \rangle$ then $\mathbf{p} \leq_{apr} \mathbf{r} \leq_{apr} \mathbf{q}$.

5) If $P_\alpha \models \text{"}\mathbf{p} \leq \mathbf{q}\text{"}$ then for some $\mathbf{p}^0, \mathbf{p}^1, \mathbf{p}^2 \in P_\alpha$ we have:

$$\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{p}^0 \leq_{vpr} \mathbf{p}^1 \approx \mathbf{p}^2 \leq_{apr} \mathbf{q}.$$

6) If $\mathbf{p} \in P_\alpha, \zeta^{u[\mathbf{p}]}$ is a limit ordinal, $\xi < \zeta$ large enough as in 1.11(B)(δ)(c), $\mathbf{p}^{[u(\mathbf{p})^{[\xi]}]} \leq_{apr} \mathbf{q}'$ then we can find $\mathbf{q} \in P_\alpha, \mathbf{p} \leq_{apr} \mathbf{q}$ such that $\mathbf{q}^{[u[\mathbf{q}]^{[\xi]}]} = \mathbf{q}'$, and 1.11(B)(δ)(c) holds for $\mathbf{q}, \xi$.

7) If $\mathbf{p} \in P_\alpha, u \leq_e u[\mathbf{p}]$, of course $\mathbf{p}^{[u]} \leq_{pr} \mathbf{p}$ and $\mathbf{p}^{[u]} \leq_{apr} \mathbf{q} \in P_\alpha$ then there is a unique $\mathbf{r} \in P_\alpha$ such that $\mathbf{p} \leq_{apr} \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}^{[u]} = \mathbf{q}$ and for any v :

$$[\gamma \in \text{Dom}(v) \setminus \text{Dom}(u[\mathbf{q}]) \ \& \ v \leq_e u[\mathbf{p}] \Rightarrow s_\gamma^{v,\mathbf{p}} = s_\gamma^{v,\mathbf{r}} \ \& \ \mathbf{t}_\gamma^{v,\mathbf{p}} = \mathbf{t}_\gamma^{v,\mathbf{r}}].$$

8) For any $\mathbf{p} \in P_\alpha, \bar{\varphi} \in \Phi^{u[\mathbf{p}]}$ and $u^* = u[\mathbf{p}]^{[\bar{\varphi}^*]}$ and $\zeta < \zeta^{u[\mathbf{p}]}$ there are $E = E_{\zeta, u^*}^{\mathbf{p}}$ and a set Φ^* such that:

- (a) E is an equivalence relation on $\Phi_{\zeta, u^*}^{u[\mathbf{p}]} = \{\bar{\varphi} \in \Phi_\zeta^{u[\mathbf{p}]} : \bar{\varphi} \upharpoonright [\zeta^{u^*}, \zeta^{u[\mathbf{p}]}) = \bar{\varphi}^*\}$
- (b) E has finitely many equivalence classes
- (c) if $\bar{\varphi}^1 E \bar{\varphi}^2$ then $F_{\bar{\varphi}^1, \bar{\varphi}^2}^{u[\mathbf{p}]}$ (see 1.7(12)) is an order preserving function from $u[\mathbf{p}]^{[\bar{\varphi}^2]}$ onto $u[\mathbf{p}]^{[\bar{\varphi}^1]}$
- (d) $\Phi \subseteq \Phi_{\zeta, u^*}^{u[\mathbf{p}]}$ is a finite set of representatives
- (e) if $\bar{\varphi}^1, \bar{\varphi}^2 \in \Phi^{u[\mathbf{p}]}, \bar{\varphi}^1 E \bar{\varphi}^3, \bar{\varphi}^2 E \bar{\varphi}^4$ and $\gamma \in \text{Dom}(u[\mathbf{p}]^{\bar{\varphi}^3}) \cap \text{Dom}(u[\mathbf{p}]^{\bar{\varphi}^4})$ then $F_{\bar{\varphi}^1, \bar{\varphi}^3}^{u[\mathbf{p}]}(\gamma) = F_{\bar{\varphi}^2, \bar{\varphi}^4}^{u[\mathbf{p}]}(\gamma)$
- (f) if $\bar{\varphi}^1 E \bar{\varphi}^2$ then $F_{\bar{\varphi}^1, \bar{\varphi}^2}^{u[\mathbf{p}]}$ maps $\mathbf{p}^{[u[\bar{\varphi}^1]]}$ to $\mathbf{p}^{[u[\bar{\varphi}^2]]}$.
- (g) If $\gamma \in \text{Dom}(u[\mathbf{p}]), \mathbf{p} \in P_\alpha$ and a_γ is countable and $t = t_y^{u[\mathbf{p}], \mathbf{p}} \in \mathbf{t}_\gamma^{u[\mathbf{p}^0], \mathbf{p}}$ then for a unique $v = v[t, \mathbf{p}] \leq_e u[\mathbf{p}]$ and $\bar{\varphi} = \langle \varphi_\zeta : \xi \leq \zeta < \zeta^u \rangle$ we have $k_\xi^{u[\mathbf{p}]} = 1, \gamma \in \text{Dom}(u^{\bar{\varphi} \upharpoonright [\xi+1, \zeta^{u[\mathbf{p}]})} \setminus \text{Dom}(u^{\bar{\varphi}})$, so necessarily $\mathcal{I}_{y,k}^{u,\gamma} \subseteq \mathcal{I}[u[\bar{\varphi}]]$. Moreover ξ is the same for all $t \in \mathbf{t}_\gamma^{u[\mathbf{p}], \mathbf{p}}$ (and it is ξ from 1.9(15)).

Proof. E.g.

8) This is proved for each ζ , by induction on $\zeta^{u[\mathbf{p}]}$. Now the case $\zeta^{u[\mathbf{p}]} = \zeta$ is trivial and the cases $\zeta^{u[\mathbf{p}]}$ is limit or $\zeta^{u[\mathbf{p}]} = \xi + 1$ & $k_\xi^{u[\mathbf{p}]} = 1$ follows easily by the induction hypothesis. So we can assume $\zeta^{u[\mathbf{p}]} = \xi + 1 > \zeta, k_\xi^{u[\mathbf{p}]} = 2$; let $\mathbf{e}$ be an

equivalence relation on $\theta_\xi^{u[\mathbf{p}]}$ as in clause $(\delta)(b)(iii)$ of Definition 1.11; Part (B). Let $i_0 < \dots < i_{n(*)-1}$ be representatives of the $\mathbf{e}$ -equivalence classes. For $n < n(*)$ let $\mathbf{p}^n = \mathbf{p}^{[u[\mathbf{p}]^{(i_n)}]}$, so $\zeta^{u[\mathbf{p}^n]} = \xi < \zeta^{u[\mathbf{p}]}$, so by the induction hypothesis there is an equivalence relation E_n on $\Phi_\zeta^{u[\mathbf{p}^n]}$ as required. Now define the E we desire:

$\bar{\varphi}^1 E \bar{\varphi}^2$ iff $\varphi_\xi^1 \mathbf{e} \varphi_\xi^2$ and $\bar{\varphi}^1 \upharpoonright [\zeta, \xi) E_n \bar{\varphi}^2 \upharpoonright [\zeta, \xi)$ for each $n < n(*)$.

The checking is easy.

□_{1.12}

The following claim helps as the Q_β 's were required to be simple.

1.13 Claim. *If $\bar{a}$ is an α -sequence and $\beta < \alpha$, $\bar{Q} \in K^{\bar{a}}$ and $n < \omega$ then
 $\mathcal{I}_\beta^{n,0} =: \{\mathbf{p} \in P_\alpha : \beta \in \text{Dom}(u[\mathbf{p}]) \text{ and } \bar{s}_\beta^{u[\mathbf{p}],\mathbf{p}} \text{ has domain including } \{0, \dots, n-1\}\}$
 is dense (subset of P_α) and even
 $\mathcal{I}_\beta^{n,1} = \{\mathbf{p} \in P_\alpha : \beta \in \text{Dom}(u[\mathbf{p}]) \text{ and for some } m \in [n, \omega) \text{ we have } \bar{s}_\beta^{u[\mathbf{p}],\mathbf{p}}(m) \neq 0\}$
 is dense (subset of P_α).*

Proof. Let $\mathbf{p} \in P_\alpha$; by clauses $(\beta)(a) + (\delta)(a)$ of the part B of Definition 1.11, there is $\mathbf{q}$ such that $\mathbf{p} \leq \mathbf{q}$ and $\beta \in \text{Dom}(u[\mathbf{q}])$. So by a variant of 1.11 Part (F) it is enough to prove (we shall use the simplicity of Q_β ; i.e. Definition 1.1(1)):

- (*) if $\mathbf{p} \in P_\alpha, \beta \in \text{Dom}(u[\mathbf{p}])$ and $\mathbf{p} \upharpoonright \beta \leq \mathbf{q} \in P_\beta$ then for some $m < \omega$ for every $k < \omega$ there are $\mathbf{r}$ and $\{s_1^*, \dots, s_m^*\}$ such that:
 $\mathbf{q} \leq_{\text{apr}} \mathbf{r} \in P_\beta$ and $\mathbf{r} \Vdash_{P_\beta} \text{"}\{t \upharpoonright k : t \in \mathbf{t}_\beta^{u[\mathbf{p}],\mathbf{p}}\} = \{s_1^*, \dots, s_m^*\}\text{"}$.

If a_β has cardinality $\geq \kappa$, this is easy (as by 1.11 of part (B), clause $(\beta)(c)$ the set $\mathbf{t}_\beta^{u[\mathbf{p}],\mathbf{p}}$ is finite) so assume a_β has cardinality $< \kappa$.

Our problem is that we do not just have to force a value to the set

$\{t(n) : t \in \mathbf{t}_\gamma^{u[\mathbf{p}],\mathbf{p}}\}$ such that it is finite, but we need an apriory bound, one not depending on the process. So the natural (and first) approach induction on $\zeta^\mathbf{p}$ seems problematic. Here our restriction in the case a_α is of cardinality $< \kappa$ (in the definition of the iteration, see clause $(\delta)(a)(iv)$ of Definition 1.11) help.

Let ξ be as in 1.9(15) for $\gamma, \mathbf{p}$ (and also as in 1.12(9)).

Let $\Phi^* = \{\bar{\varphi} : \bar{\varphi} \in \Phi_\xi^{u[\mathbf{p}]}$ and $\gamma \in \text{Dom}(u^{\bar{\varphi} \upharpoonright (\xi+1, \zeta^{u[\mathbf{p}]})}) \setminus \text{Dom}(u^{\bar{\varphi}})\}$ and assume without loss of generality $(u[\mathbf{p}] \upharpoonright \gamma) \leq_{de} u[\mathbf{q}]$ and let $\bar{\psi} = \psi^{u[\mathbf{q}]} \upharpoonright [\zeta^{u[\mathbf{p}]}, \zeta^{u[\mathbf{q}]}]$.

Let $E = E_{\xi, \bar{\psi}}^{\mathbf{q}}$ and Φ^* be as in 1.12(8). Let

$\Phi^\otimes = \{\bar{\varphi} \in \Phi_\xi^{\mathbf{q}} : \text{there is } \bar{\varphi}' \in \Phi^* \text{ such that } \bar{\varphi}' \wedge \bar{\psi}^* \text{ belongs to } \bar{\varphi}/E\}$, for

$\bar{\varphi} = \bar{\varphi}' \wedge \bar{\psi} \in \Phi^\otimes$ let $\mathbf{t}_{\bar{\varphi}} = \mathbf{t}_{u[\mathbf{p}]^{\bar{\varphi}^1}, \mathbf{p}}$. Now let $\Phi^1 = \Phi^1 \cap \Phi^\otimes$ and $\bar{\varphi}^0, \dots, \bar{\varphi}^{n-1}$ list Φ^1 and $|\mathbf{t}_{\bar{\varphi}}| \leq n'$ for $\bar{\varphi} \in \Phi^\otimes$.

Let $u^\ell = u[\mathbf{r}]^{[\bar{\varphi}^\ell]}$.

Now choose $m = nm'$; so to show (*) let k be given, choose $\mathbf{q}'$ such that $\mathbf{q} \leq \mathbf{q}' \in P_\gamma$ and $\mathbf{q}'$ force value to $t(k')$ for $k' < k, t \in \bigcup_{\ell < n} \mathbf{t}_\gamma^{u^\ell, \mathbf{p}}$ moreover for

$\ell < n, (\mathbf{q}')^{[u^\ell]}$ force values to $t \upharpoonright k$ for $t \in \mathbf{t}_\gamma^{u^\ell, \mathbf{p}}$.

For $\bar{\varphi} \in \Phi^\otimes$ such that $\bar{\varphi} E \bar{\varphi}^\ell$ let $\mathbf{r}^{\bar{\varphi}} = F_{\bar{\varphi}, \bar{\varphi}^\ell}^{\mathbf{q}}(\mathbf{r}^{[u[\mathbf{q}]]^{\bar{\varphi}^\ell}})$.

Now we choose $\mathbf{r}$ by increasing $\mathbf{q}^{[u]}$ if $u \in \{u[\mathbf{q}]]^{\bar{\varphi}} : \bar{\varphi} \in \Phi^\otimes\}$ and essentially only there. Explicitly:

- (i) $u[\mathbf{r}] = u[\mathbf{q}]$
- (ii) if $\beta \in \text{Dom}(u[\mathbf{q}]^{[\bar{\varphi}]})$ for some $\bar{\varphi} \in \Phi^\otimes$ then

$$s_\beta^{u[\mathbf{q}], \mathbf{r}} = s_\gamma^{u[\mathbf{r}^{\bar{\varphi}}], \mathbf{r}^{\bar{\varphi}}}$$

- (well defined by 1.12(8) clause (c))
- (iii) if $\beta \in \text{Dom}(u[\mathbf{q}])$ and clause (ii) does not apply then $s_\beta^{u[\mathbf{r}], \mathbf{r}}$ is chosen as $s_\gamma^{u[\mathbf{q}], \mathbf{q}}$
- (iv) if $\beta \in \text{Dom}(u)$, $u \leq_e u[\mathbf{q}]^{[\bar{\varphi}]}$, $\bar{\varphi} \in \Phi^\otimes$ then $\mathbf{t}^{u, \mathbf{r}} = \mathbf{t}^{u, \mathbf{r}^{\bar{\varphi}}}$ (again by 1.12(8) it is well defined)
- (v) if $\beta \in \text{Dom}(u)$, $u \leq u[\mathbf{q}]$ and clause (iv) does not apply then

$$\mathbf{t}_\beta^{u, \mathbf{r}} = \mathbf{t}_\beta^{u, \mathbf{q}} \cup \bigcup \{\mathbf{t}_\beta^{v, \mathbf{q}} : v <_e u\}$$

(i.e. the definition is by induction on ζ^u).

We leave the rest to the reader. □_{1.13}

1.14 Fact. 1) If $u_1 \leq_e u_2 \in \text{CR}_\alpha$, $\mathbf{p}_1 \in P_\alpha$ and $u[\mathbf{p}_1] = u_1$ then there is $\mathbf{p}_2, \mathbf{p}_1 \leq_{vpr} \mathbf{p}_2 \in P_\alpha$ such that $u[\mathbf{p}_2] = u_2$ in fact if $\mathbf{p}_1 \leq \mathbf{p}'_2$ and $u[\mathbf{p}'_2] = u_2$ then $\mathbf{p}_2 \leq_{apr} \mathbf{p}'_2$.
 2) Suppose $u^0 \leq_{de} u^1 \leq_{de} u^2$, $u[\mathbf{p}^0] = u^0$, $u[\mathbf{p}^2] = u^2$ and $\mathbf{p}^0, \mathbf{p}^1$ are strongly compatible then $(\mathbf{p}^2)^{[u^1]}, \mathbf{p}^1$ are strongly compatible.

In fact, if $\mathbf{p}_0, \mathbf{p}_2$ are strongly compatible in u and $p'_\ell = \mathbf{p}_\ell^{[u_\ell]}$ then $\mathbf{p}_0^1, \mathbf{p}_1'$ are strongly compatible.

Proof. 1) Check the definitions.
 2) Check the definitions.

1.15 Claim. 1) For any ordinal α and α -sequence $\bar{a}$, for any $\bar{Q} \in K^{\bar{a}}$ and $u^* \in \text{CR}_{\bar{a}}$, the partial order $(\{\mathbf{p} \in P_\alpha : u[\mathbf{p}] \leq_e u^*\}, \leq)$ satisfies the c.c.c. and even the Knaster condition.

2) If $\kappa = \aleph_1$ and $u \in \text{CR}_\alpha$ and $\bar{Q} \in K^\alpha$ then the set $\{\bar{s}^{u, \mathbf{p}} : \mathbf{p} \in P_\alpha, u = u[\mathbf{p}]\}$ is countable.

3) If $\mathbf{p}_\sigma \in P_\alpha$, $u(\mathbf{p}_\sigma) = u^* (\in \text{CR}_{\bar{a}})$, $\sigma < \omega_1$ then for some uncountable $A \subseteq \omega_1$, for any $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in A$ the conditions $\mathbf{p}_{\sigma_1}, \mathbf{p}_{\sigma_2}$ are strongly compatible (in u^*) and so have a (canonical) common upper bound.

4) For any $\bar{Q} \in K^\alpha$ and $\bar{u} = \langle u_\zeta : \zeta < \omega_1 \rangle$ such that $u_\zeta \in \text{CR}_{\alpha, \zeta}$ and $\bar{u}$ is $\leq_{de}$ -increasing continuous we have: $(\{\mathbf{p} \in P_\alpha : u[\mathbf{p}] \leq u_\zeta \text{ for some } \zeta < \omega_1\}, \leq)$ satisfies the c.c.c.

Proof. 1) So it follows from part (3) by 1.14(1).

2) By induction on ζ^* - (essentially included in the proof of part (3). If we are satisfied with the case $\kappa = \aleph_1$, this simplifies the proof of parts (3),(4).)

3) We prove by induction on ζ^{u^*} .

First Case: $\zeta^{u^*} = 0$.

Trivial.

Second Case: $\zeta^{u^*} = \xi + 1, k_\xi^{u^*} = 1$. Let $v^* = (u^*)^{[\xi]}$, $\mathbf{p}'_\sigma = \mathbf{p}_\sigma^{[v^*]}$. By the induction hypothesis without loss of generality the conclusion of (3) holds for $\langle \mathbf{p}'_\sigma : \sigma < \omega_1 \rangle, A = \omega_1$. By Definition 1.11 part(B), clause $(\beta)(e)$ if $\kappa = \aleph_1$ the set $\{\bar{s}^{u^*, \mathbf{p}_\sigma} \upharpoonright (\text{Dom}(u^*) \setminus \text{Dom}(v^*) : \sigma < \omega_1)\}$ is countable so without loss of generality $\bar{s}^{u^*, \mathbf{p}_\sigma} \upharpoonright (\text{Dom}(u^*) \setminus \text{Dom}(v^*))$ for $\sigma \in A$ is constant. But even not assuming $\kappa = \aleph_1$, letting $a_\sigma = \{\gamma : \gamma \in \text{Dom}(u^*) \text{ but } \gamma \notin \text{Dom}(v^*) \text{ and } s_\gamma^{u^*, \mathbf{p}_\sigma} \neq \emptyset \ \& \ \mathbf{t}_\gamma^{u^*, \mathbf{p}_\sigma} \neq \emptyset\}$ is finite hence without loss of generality $\langle a_\sigma : \sigma < \omega_1 \rangle$ form a Δ -system with heart say a^* and $\bar{s}^{u^*, \mathbf{p}_\sigma} \upharpoonright a^* = \bar{s}^*$; i.e. is constant. Now clearly $\langle \mathbf{p}_\sigma : \sigma < \omega_1 \rangle$ are pairwise strongly compatible as required.

Third Case: $\zeta^{u^*} = \xi + 1, k_\xi^{u^*} = 2$. For each $\sigma < \omega_1$ we have an equivalence relation $\mathbf{e}_\sigma$ on $\theta_\xi^{u^*}$, as in Definition 1.11 part (B), clause $(\gamma)(f)(iii)$, so it is convex with finitely many equivalence classes, so the number of possible $\mathbf{e}$'s is $\leq |\sum_n \theta_\xi^{u^*}|^n$; as

$\theta_\xi^{u^*} < \omega_1$ without loss of generality $\mathbf{e}_\sigma = \mathbf{e}$. Let $a \subseteq \theta_\xi^{u^*}$ be a set of representatives. Let $v_i = (u^*)^{(i)}$ for $i < \theta_\xi^{u^*}$. By successive application of the induction hypothesis to $\langle \mathbf{p}_\sigma^{[v_i]} : \sigma < \omega_1 \rangle$ without loss of generality for $i \in a$ we have $\langle \mathbf{p}_\sigma^{(v_i)} : \sigma < \omega_1 \rangle$ satisfies the conclusion for $A = \omega_1$.

By use of the $F_{(i,j)}^{u^*}$ this holds for any $i < \theta_\xi^{u^*}$. Now it suffices to prove that for any $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 < \omega_1$, the conditions $\mathbf{p}_{\sigma_1}, \mathbf{p}_{\sigma_2}$ are strongly compatible; so let $\gamma \in u[\mathbf{p}_{\sigma_1}] = u[\mathbf{p}_{\sigma_2}] = u^*$. If $\gamma \notin \bigcap_{i < \theta_\xi} \text{Dom}(v_i)$ then (see Definition 1.5) for exactly

on $i = i(\gamma)$ we have $\gamma \in v_i$, so necessarily $(s_\gamma^{u^*, \mathbf{p}_{\sigma_\ell}}, \mathbf{t}_\gamma^{u^*, \mathbf{p}_{\sigma_\ell}}) = (s_\gamma^{v_i, \mathbf{p}_{\sigma_\ell}}, \mathbf{t}_\gamma^{v_i, \mathbf{p}_{\sigma_\ell}})$ for $\ell = 1, 2$ and by the application of the induction hypothesis above we get the desired conclusion. So assume $\gamma \in \bigcap_{i < \theta_\xi} \text{Dom}(v_i)$; now if a_γ has cardinality $< \kappa$, then by

Definition 1.11, Part (B) clause $(\beta)(d)$ and $(*)$ of Definition 1.8(2) for all $i < \theta_\xi$, we get the same pair $(s_\gamma^{v_i, \mathbf{p}_{\sigma_\ell}}, \mathbf{t}_\gamma^{v_i, \mathbf{p}_{\sigma_\ell}})$, so we are done, so assume also a_γ has cardinality $< \kappa$.

Also if $s_\gamma^{v_i, \mathbf{p}_{\sigma_1}} = s_\gamma^{v_i, \mathbf{p}_{\sigma_2}}$ we are done, so by symmetry without loss of generality $s_\gamma^{v_i, \mathbf{p}_{\sigma_1}} \subset s_\gamma^{v_i, \mathbf{p}_{\sigma_2}}$ but the s 's do not depend on i and by what we do for each i (and 1.14) we have $\mathbf{t}_\gamma^{v_i, \mathbf{p}_{\sigma_1}} = \emptyset$, hence $\mathbf{t}_\gamma^{u[\mathbf{p}_{\sigma_1}], \mathbf{p}_{\sigma_1}} = \bigcup_{i < \theta_\xi} \mathbf{t}_\gamma^{u[\mathbf{p}_{\sigma_1}], \mathbf{p}_{\sigma_1}} = \emptyset$, and we are done.

Fourth Case: ζ^{u^*} limit and we know (see Definition 1.11 part(B), clause $(\beta)(d)$) that for each $\sigma < \omega_1$, there is $\zeta_\sigma < \zeta^{u^*}$ such that $[\gamma \in \text{Dom}(u^*) \setminus \text{Dom}(u^{[\xi]}] \Rightarrow s_\gamma^u = \emptyset = \mathbf{t}_\gamma^u]$ (i.e. we only duplicate). If $\kappa = \aleph_1$, clearly without loss of generality $\zeta_\sigma = \zeta^*$ for $\sigma < \omega_1$; now we use the induction hypothesis on $\langle p_\sigma^{[\zeta^*]} : \sigma < \omega_1 \rangle$ using 1.12(6). So assume $\kappa > \aleph_1$ and let $\langle \varepsilon_\sigma : \sigma < \text{cf}(\zeta^{u^*}) \rangle$ be increasing continuous with limit ζ . If $\text{cf}(\zeta) = \aleph_0$, then for some $\sigma(*) < \omega_1, A =: \{\sigma < \omega_1 : \zeta_\sigma < \varepsilon_{\sigma(*)}\}$ is uncountable and continue as above with $\zeta^* = \varepsilon_{\sigma(*)}$. If $\text{cf}(\zeta) > \aleph_1$, for some $\zeta^* < \zeta$ we have $(\forall \sigma < \omega_1)[\zeta_\sigma < \zeta^*]$ and continue as above. We are left with the case $\text{cf}(\zeta) = \aleph_1$, which has the same proof as part (4) (using the induction hypothesis).

Now for each limit $\sigma < \omega_1$, there is $\xi_\sigma < \varepsilon_\sigma$ such that $\alpha \in \text{Dom}((u^*)^{[\varepsilon_\sigma]})$ & $\alpha \notin \text{Dom}((u^*)^{[\xi_\sigma]}) \Rightarrow s_\alpha^{u^*, \mathbf{p}_\sigma} = \emptyset$. By Fodor's lemma for some stationary $s \subseteq \omega_1$, we have $\sigma \in S \Rightarrow \xi_\sigma = \xi^*$, and without loss of generality $\sigma_1 < \sigma_2$ in $s \Rightarrow \zeta_{\sigma_1} < \varepsilon_{\sigma_2}$.

We now apply the induction hypothesis to $\langle p'_\sigma - p^{[(u^*)^{[\xi^*]}]} : \sigma \in s \rangle$.

4)? Like the proof of the last possibility in the proof of part (3) ($\text{cf}(\zeta^u) = \aleph_1$).

5) If $u \in CR_\alpha$ and $\zeta \leq \zeta^u$ then there is an equivalence relation E on Φ_ζ^u with finitely many equivalence classes.

For each $\sigma < \omega_1$ choose $\zeta_\sigma < \omega$ such that $u^{\mathbf{p}_\sigma} \leq_e u_{\zeta_\sigma}$ so without loss of generality $\zeta_\sigma > \sigma$ choose $\mathbf{p}'_\sigma \in P_\alpha$ such that $u[\mathbf{p}'_\sigma] \approx u_{\zeta_\sigma}$ and $\mathbf{p}_\sigma \leq_{vpr} \mathbf{p}'_\sigma$ and let $\mathbf{p}''_\sigma \approx \mathbf{p}'_\sigma$, $u[\mathbf{p}''_\sigma] = u_{\zeta_\sigma}$, and for limit $\sigma < \omega_1$ choose $\xi_\sigma < \zeta[u_\sigma]$ such that $\gamma \in \text{Dom}((u_{\zeta_\sigma})^{[\sigma]})$ & $\gamma \notin \text{Dom}((u_{\zeta_\sigma})^{[\xi_\sigma]}) \Rightarrow s_\gamma^{u_{\zeta_\sigma}, \mathbf{p}''_\sigma} = \emptyset$ without loss of generality $\xi_\sigma = \zeta[u_{\zeta'_\sigma}]$, $\zeta'_\sigma < \sigma$ and choose a stationary set of limit ordinals $< \omega_1$ such that $\sigma \in S \Rightarrow \zeta''_\sigma = \zeta^*$ and $\sigma_1 < \sigma_2$ in $S \Rightarrow \zeta^*_{\sigma_1} < \sigma_2$. Let $v = ?$

Apply part (3) on $\langle (p''_\sigma)^{[u_{\zeta^*}]} : \sigma \in S \rangle$ get an uncountable $S_2 \subseteq S$; now $\langle p_\sigma : \sigma \in S_1 \rangle$ is as required. $\square_{1.15}$

1.16 Claim. *Let $\mathbf{p} \in P_\alpha$ and let τ be a P_α -name of an ordinal. Then there is $\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p} \leq_{vpr} \mathbf{q} \in P_\alpha$ such that:*

- (*) *if $\mathbf{q} \leq \mathbf{r} \in P_\alpha$, $\mathbf{r} \Vdash \tau = \sigma$ then for some $\mathbf{r}'$, letting $\bar{\varphi}$ be such that $u[\mathbf{q}] = u[\mathbf{r}']^{[\bar{\varphi}]}$, $\mathbf{q}' = (\mathbf{r}')^{[\bar{\varphi}]}$ we have $\mathbf{q}' \Vdash \tau = \sigma$.*

Moreover

- (**) *there is a countable family $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \{\mathbf{r}' : \text{for some } u, u^{\mathbf{p}} \leq_{de} \mathbf{r}' \leq_{de} \mathbf{q}, \text{ and } \mathbf{q}^{[u]} \leq_{apr} \mathbf{r}' \text{ and } \mathbf{r}' \text{ force a value to } \tau\}$ such that $\mathbf{q} \leq \mathbf{q}'$ & $(\mathbf{q}' \text{ force a value to } \tau) \Rightarrow \mathbf{q}' \text{ is strongly compatible with some } \mathbf{r}' \in \mathcal{I}$.*

Proof. Assume that there is no $\mathbf{q}$ satisfying (**). We choose by induction on $\varepsilon < \omega_1$, $\mathbf{q}_\varepsilon, \mathbf{r}_\varepsilon$ such that:

- (a) $\langle \mathbf{q}_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \omega_1 \rangle$ is $\leq_{vpr}$ -increasing (in P_α)
(so $\langle u[\mathbf{q}_\varepsilon] : \varepsilon < \omega_1 \rangle$ is $\leq_{de}$ -increasing continuous)
(b) for each successor ε there is $\mathbf{r}_\varepsilon, \mathbf{q}_\varepsilon \leq_{apr} \mathbf{r}_\varepsilon$, $\mathbf{r}_\varepsilon$ forces a value to τ , and $\mathbf{r}_\varepsilon$ is not strongly compatible with any $\mathbf{r}_\zeta, \zeta < \varepsilon$ successor.

For $\varepsilon = 0$ let $\mathbf{q}_0 = \mathbf{p}$, for limit ε use 1.12(3), for ε successor use the assumption that “there is no $\mathbf{q}$ as required”; i.e. suppose we cannot find such $\mathbf{r}_\varepsilon$.

Let $\mathcal{I}_\varepsilon = \{\mathbf{r} : \mathbf{q}_{\varepsilon-1} \leq_{apr} \mathbf{r} \text{ and } \mathbf{r} \text{ force a value to } \tau\}$, $\mathbf{r}_{\zeta+1} : \zeta + 1 < \varepsilon$ (so if $\mathbf{q}_{\varepsilon-1} \leq \mathbf{r}$ and force a value to τ hence for some successor ordinal $\zeta < \varepsilon$ we have $\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}_\zeta$ are strongly compatible).

So we are assuming there is no $\mathbf{q}$ as required in (*) we can carry the induction.

Lastly, $\langle u[\mathbf{q}_\varepsilon] : \varepsilon < \omega_1 \rangle$ and $\langle \mathbf{r}_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \omega_1 \rangle$ contradict 1.15(4).

Why (**) $\Rightarrow$ (*)? So let $\mathbf{q}_{\varepsilon-1}, \mathcal{I}_\varepsilon = \{\mathbf{r}_{\zeta+1} : \zeta + 1 < \varepsilon\}$, be as gotten above. Now if $\mathbf{q}_{\varepsilon-1} \leq \mathbf{r} \in P_\alpha$, then for some $\mathbf{r}', \mathbf{r} \leq \mathbf{r}' \in \mathbf{p}_\alpha$, $\mathbf{r}'$ force a value to τ . So by 1.14(3),

$\mathbf{r}^{[u_{\varepsilon-1}]}, \mathbf{r}_\zeta$ are strongly compatible and so their canonical common upper bound is in $\mathcal{I}_\varepsilon$ and easily is $\leq$ the canonical common upper bound of $\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}_\zeta$, hence $\mathcal{I}_\varepsilon$ satisfies: for a dense set of $\mathbf{r} \in P_\alpha, u[\mathbf{q}_{\varepsilon-1}] \leq_e \mathbf{r} \Rightarrow \mathbf{r}^{[u[\mathbf{q}_{\varepsilon-1}]]} \in \mathcal{I}_\varepsilon$; as required. $\square_{1.16}$

1.17 Conclusion Forcing with P_α (for $\bar{Q} \in K^\alpha$) does not collapse $\aleph_1$, in fact the regularity of any cardinal $\leq \kappa$ is preserved; and the forcing notion is proper.

Proof. By 1.14, 1.15 (using 1.5).

1.18 Claim. Let $\bar{Q} \in K^{\bar{a}}$.

- 1) For any $\beta < \alpha$ the set $\{\mathbf{p} \in P_\alpha : \beta \in u[\mathbf{p}]\}$ is dense (and open).
- 2) For any $\beta < \alpha$ satisfying “ a_β has cardinality $< \kappa$ ” and P_β -name τ of a member of ${}^\omega\omega$ defined by elements with support $\subseteq a_\beta$ the set $\{\mathbf{p}_\alpha \in P_\alpha : \tau \in \mathbf{t}_\beta^{u[\mathbf{p}], \mathbf{p}}\}$ is a dense subset of P_α .

Proof. 1) We can use the case $k_\xi = 1$, i.e. for any $\mathbf{p} \in P_\alpha$, such that $\beta \notin u^*u[\mathbf{p}]$ define $v^\otimes$ by: $v^\otimes \in \text{CR}_{\alpha, \zeta, u[\mathbf{p}]}, (v^\otimes) = u^*, \text{Dom}(v^\otimes) = \text{Dom}(u^*) \cup \{\beta\}$ and $\mathbf{q} = \langle q_v : v \leq_e v^\otimes \rangle, q_v = p_v$ if $v \leq_e u[\mathbf{p}]$ and $s_\gamma^{v^*, \mathbf{q}}$ is $s_\gamma^{u^*, \mathbf{p}}$ if $\gamma \in u^*$ and $\emptyset$ otherwise, $\mathbf{t}_\gamma^{v, \mathbf{q}} = \mathbf{t}_\gamma^{v, \mathbf{p}}$ if $v \leq_e u^*$ and $\emptyset$ otherwise. Easily $\mathbf{p} \leq \mathbf{q}, \beta \in \text{Dom}(u[\mathbf{q}])$. $\square_{1.18}$

1.19 Conclusion. 1) If $\bar{Q} \in K_{\bar{a}}$ and a_β has cardinality $\geq \kappa$, then $\Vdash_{P_\alpha} “s_\alpha = \cup\{s_\alpha^{u[\mathbf{p}], \mathbf{p}} : \mathbf{p} \in G_{P_{\alpha+1}}, \alpha \in \text{Dom}(\mathbf{p})\}$ is in ${}^\omega\omega$, every initial segment is in $\tilde{S}_{Q_\alpha}$ (see Definition 1.1)), for infinitely many $n, s_\alpha(n) \neq 0$ and for every finite $\mathbf{t} \subseteq ({}^\omega\omega)^{V^{P_\alpha}}$ defined by P_α -names described by conditions of P_α with support $\subseteq a_\alpha$, for some n , for every $m > n$ we have $(s_\alpha \restriction n, \mathbf{t}) \leq (s_\alpha \restriction m, \mathbf{t})$ ”.

1.20 Claim. Assume κ is regular uncountable and $\bar{a}$ is a (μ, α) -sequence. Assume further $\bar{Q} \in K^{\bar{a}}$ and $P_\alpha = \text{Lim}^{\alpha, \bar{a}} \bar{Q}$.

- 1) P_α satisfies the $(2^{<\kappa})^+$ -c.c.c. (if $2 \in \Theta$).
- 2) Assume $\mu = \text{cf}(\mu) > |\alpha|^{<\kappa}$ for $\alpha < \kappa$ (so $\mu > \kappa$) and $\gamma < \alpha \Rightarrow |a_\gamma| < \mu$. If $S \subseteq \{\delta < \mu : \text{cf}(\delta) = \aleph_0\}$ is stationary and $\clubsuit_S$ holds in V say exemplifies by $\bar{c} = \langle c_\delta : \delta \in S \rangle$ (and $\omega \in \Theta$), then forcing with P_α preserves it, even for the same $\bar{c}$.
- 3) Assume $\text{cf}(\alpha) > \mu$ and $\alpha = \sup\{\beta : a_\beta \text{ has cardinality } < \kappa\}$ and $\mathbf{p} \in P_\alpha$ and $\mathbf{p} \Vdash “f_i \in {}^\omega\omega \text{ for } i < \mu”$. Then for some $\mathbf{q}$ and β we have: $\mathbf{p} \leq \mathbf{q} \in P_\alpha$ and $\mathbf{q} \Vdash_{P_\alpha}$ “for unboundedly many $i < \mu$ we have $f_i \in \mathbf{t}_\beta^{u[\mathbf{r}], \mathbf{r}}$ for some $\mathbf{r} \in G_{P_\alpha}$; hence for any finite set w of such i ’s, some n for every $m > n$ we have $(s_\beta \restriction n, \{f_i : i \in w\}) \leq (s_\beta \restriction m, \{f_i : i \in w\})$ ”.

1.21 Remark. 1) We are most interested in the case $\text{otp}(c) = \omega$, but any countable ordinal is O.K.

Proof. 1) Let $\mathbf{p}_i \in P_\alpha$ for $i < (2^{<\kappa})^+$. We can define the set of isomorphism types: it has cardinality $\leq 2^{<\kappa}$ as all $t_{\gamma,y}^{u,\mathbf{p}_i}$ is a name involving only $< \kappa$ conditions.

So without loss of generality this isomorphism type is fixed. Let $A_i = \cup\{a_\beta : \text{for some } j < i, \beta \in u^{\mathbf{p}_j}\}$, so $|A_i| < \kappa$, and A_i is increasing continuous in i . Without loss of generality, for some stationary $A \subseteq \{\delta < (2^{<\kappa})^+ : \text{cf}(\delta) = \kappa\}$ we have $\langle u[\mathbf{p}_i] : i \in A \rangle$ is a Δ -system; i.e. $\langle \text{Dom}(u^{\mathbf{p}_i}) : i \in A \rangle$ is a Δ -system, $\text{otp}(\text{Dom}(u^{\mathbf{p}_i}))$ for $i \in A$ is constant and letting $F_{i,j}$ be the (one to one) order preserving function from $\text{Dom}(u^{\mathbf{p}_j})$ onto $\text{Dom}(u^{\mathbf{p}_i})$, so for $i, j \in A$, $F_{i,j}$ maps $u^{\mathbf{p}_j}$ to $u^{\mathbf{p}_i}$ and $\mathbf{p}_j$ to $\mathbf{p}_i$.

In particular $\bar{s}^{u[\mathbf{p}_i],\mathbf{p}_i}, \bar{s}^{u[\mathbf{p}_j],\mathbf{p}_j}$ agree on the intersection of their domains. So for $i, j \in A$ (as $2 \in \Theta$) there is $u \in \text{CR}_{\bar{a}}, u_i \leq_e u$ & $u_j \leq_e u$, clearly $\mathbf{p}_i, \mathbf{p}_j$ are strongly compatible inside u (see 1.14(2)) hence are compatible, as required.

2) Let $\mathbf{p} \in P_\alpha, \mathbf{p} \Vdash_{P_\alpha} \tau \subseteq \mu = \sup \tau$. For each $i < \mu$ let $\mathbf{p}_i, j_i$ be such that: $i < j_i < \mu, \mathbf{p} \leq \mathbf{p}_i$ and $\mathbf{p}_i \Vdash j_i \in \tau$ and without loss of generality $i_1 < i_2 \Rightarrow j_{i_1} < j_{i_2}$. We can find an unbounded $A \subseteq \mu$ such that the sequence $\langle p_i : i \in A \rangle$ is as in the proof of part (1). In the proof of part (1) without loss of generality; by possibly thinning A (preserving its cardinality even its being stationary we can have: if $\gamma \in \bigcap_{i \in A} \text{Dom}(u^{\mathbf{p}_i})$ and $|a_\gamma| < \mu$ then $\langle a_\gamma \cap \text{Dom} u[\mathbf{p}_i] : i \in A \rangle$ is constant.

Now any ω member of $\{\mathbf{p}_i : i \in A\}$ has a common upper bound. Now assume $\langle a_\delta : \delta \in S \rangle (a_\delta \subseteq \delta = \sup(a_\delta) \text{ and } \text{otp}(a_\delta) \in \Theta)$ exemplifies $\clubsuit_S$ in V .

For some $\delta, a_\delta \subseteq \{j_i : i \in A\}$, and we can finish.

3) As $\text{cf}(\alpha) > \mu > 2^{<\kappa}$ and as P_α satisfies the $(2^{<\kappa})^+$ -c.c.c. and as $\langle P_\beta : \beta < \alpha \rangle$ is $\leq$ o-increasing continuous in limits of cofinality $\geq \kappa$ with limit P_α , we know that for some $\beta^* < \alpha, \langle f_i : i < \kappa \rangle$ is a clearly P_{β^*} -name, $\mathbf{p} \in P_{\beta^*}$. Choose $\gamma \in (\beta^*, \alpha)$ such that $a_\gamma = \emptyset$, so easily for each i there is $\mathbf{q}_i$ satisfying $\mathbf{p} \leq \mathbf{q}_i \in P_\alpha, \gamma \in u[\mathbf{q}_i]$ and $\mathbf{t}_\gamma^{u,\mathbf{q}_i} = \{f_i\}$. As P_α satisfies the $(2^{<\kappa})^+$ -c.c.c. hence the μ -c.c.c. clearly for every $i < \mu$ large enough we have:

$$\mathbf{q}_i \Vdash_{P_\alpha} \text{“}\{j < \mu : \mathbf{q}_j \in G_{P_\alpha}\} \text{ is unbounded in } \mu\text{”}.$$

This clearly suffices. □_{1.20}

1.22 Conclusion. ($V \models CH$). For some $(\aleph_1, \omega_3)$ -sequence $\bar{a}$ and $\bar{Q} \in K^{\bar{a}}, P_{\omega_3}$ is a forcing of cardinality $\aleph_3$, satisfies the $\aleph_2$ -c.c.c., is proper and

- (a) forcing with P_{ω_3} preserves $\clubsuit_S$ for $S \subseteq S_0^2 =: \{\delta < \aleph_2 : \text{cf}(\delta) = \aleph_0\}$
- (b) for every simple Q with $g, f \in V$ and $B \subseteq {}^\omega \omega, |B| < \aleph_2$ there is $s \in {}^\omega \omega$ such that for every finite $\mathbf{t} \subseteq B$ for every large enough $n, Q \models (s \upharpoonright n, \mathbf{t}) \leq (s \upharpoonright (n+1), \mathbf{t})$ in particular
- (b)' in $V^{P_{\aleph_3}}$, if F is a countable fixed $\mathcal{U}$ a vector space over F of dimension $\aleph_0$, and $f_i \in \mathcal{U}_F$ a homomorphism for $i < \aleph_1$ then there is a independent sequence $\langle x_i : i < \omega \rangle$ of elements of $\mathcal{U}$ such that $(\forall i < \omega_1)$ [for every n large enough, $f_i(x_n) = 0$]
- (c) if $F, \mathcal{U}$ is as above, $f_i \in {}^\omega F$ a homomorphism for $i < \omega_2$ then for some unbounded $B \subseteq {}^\omega 2$ and an independent sequence $\langle x_n : n < \omega \rangle$ of members of $\mathcal{U}$ $(\forall i \in B)$ [for every n large enough, $f_i(x_n) = 0$].

Proof. We know $\text{cf}([\aleph_3]^{\aleph_1}, \subseteq) = \aleph_3$ hence we can find $\bar{a} = \langle a_\alpha : \alpha < \aleph_3 \rangle$ such that $a_\alpha \in [\alpha]^{\leq \aleph_1}$ and $(\forall a)(a \subseteq \aleph_3 \ \& \ |a| \leq \aleph_1 \rightarrow (\exists^{\aleph_3} \beta < \aleph_3)(a \subseteq a_\beta))$ and $(\forall a)(a \subseteq \aleph_\alpha \ \& \ |a| = \aleph_0 \rightarrow (\exists^{\aleph_3} \beta < \aleph_3)(a = a_\beta))$. Now choose $\bar{Q} \in K^{\bar{a}}$ such that for every $\gamma < \aleph_3$ and P_γ -name of a simple forcing notion Q with $g, f \in V$ the set $\{\beta : Q_\beta = Q[V^{P_\beta}]\}$ is unbounded in $\aleph_3$. Alternatively deal only with Q of 1.3(4) and derive the results for the others. Now use 1.20(1) for $\aleph_2$ -c.c.c., 1.17 for properness, 1.20(2) for part (a) and 1.19 for part (b) and 1.20(3) for part (c). $\square_{1.22}$

1.23 Conclusion. Let P_{ω_3} be as in 1.22. Assuming for simplicity $V \models GCH$ in $V^{P_{\omega_3}}$ there is no Gross space; i.e. for every countable field F and vector space $\mathcal{U}$ over F with inner products (i) with dimension $\aleph_0$ for some $\mathcal{U}_1, \mathcal{U}_2 \subseteq \mathcal{U}$, we have $\dim \mathcal{U}_1 = \dim \mathcal{U}$, $\dim \mathcal{U}_2 = \aleph_0$ and $\mathcal{U}_1 \perp \mathcal{U}_2$.

Proof. Let $\lambda = \dim(\mathcal{U})$ and $\langle x_i : i < \lambda \rangle$ be a basis of $\mathcal{U}$.

Case 1: $\lambda = \aleph_1$.

Use clause (b)' of the conclusion of 1.22.

Case 2: $\lambda = \aleph_2$.

Use clause (c) of the conclusion of 1.22.

Case 3: $\lambda = \aleph_3$.

Use clause (a) of the conclusion of 1.22 (i.e. let $\langle c_\alpha : \alpha \in S \rangle$ be a $\clubsuit_S$, $S \subseteq \{\delta < \aleph_2 : \text{cf}(\delta) = \aleph_0\}$ stationary).

Define $f_\beta : \omega_2 \rightarrow F$ be $f_\beta(i) = (x_\beta, x_i)$. So for each i for some $\delta(i) \in S$, $f_\beta \upharpoonright c_\delta$ is constant. So for some δ , $B_\delta = \{\gamma < \lambda : \delta(i) = \delta\}$ has cardinality λ . So $\mathcal{U}_1 = \text{Span} \langle x_\beta : \beta \in B_\delta \rangle, \mathcal{U}_i = \text{Span}\{x_i - x_j : i, j \in c_\delta\}$ are as required).

Case 4: $\lambda = \text{cf}(\lambda) > \aleph_3$ or just $\text{cf}(\lambda) > \aleph_2$.

The proof is as in the case $\lambda = \aleph_3$.

Case 5: $\lambda > \text{cf}(\lambda) \in \{\aleph_0, \aleph_1, \aleph_2\}$.

Cases of λ singular we reduce it to the problem of $\text{cf}(\lambda)$ as for $\mu \in (\aleph_3, \lambda)$ regular for some $B_\mu \in [\mu]^\mu$, $f_\mu : \aleph_2 \rightarrow F$ we have $(\forall \alpha \in B_\mu)(\forall j < \aleph_2)[(x_\alpha, x_j) = f_\mu(j)]$. $\square_{1.23}$

1.24 Remark. 1) In 1.22 - 1.23 we can replace the choice $(\kappa, \mu, \alpha) = (\aleph_1, \aleph_2, \aleph_3)$ by any other satisfying the requirements in 1.21 (e.g. $2^{<\kappa} = \kappa < \mu = \text{cf}(\mu)$, $(\forall \beta < \mu)[|\beta|^{<\kappa} < \mu]$ $\text{cf}(\alpha) > \mu$, α divisible by $|\alpha|$, $|\alpha| = |\alpha| < \mu$).

2) In creature u (i.e. in Definition 1.5) we can also incorporate the information “in Q_γ we just want to satisfy μ conditions among a family of μ ”, or we consider $< \mu$ conditions to begin with. Also making the dividing line “ $|a_\gamma| < \kappa$ ” or “ a_γ countable” does not make much difference.

3) The use of a_γ of cardinality $< \kappa$ but non-empty is when we would like in the definition of θ_γ to use as a parameter a real not in $V^{P_\gamma} \setminus V$ (or even a bounded subset of κ).

REFERENCES.

- [B] James E. Baumgartner. Decomposition of embedding of trees. *Notices Amer. Math. Soc.*, **17**:967, 1970.
- [Sh 80] Saharon Shelah. A weak generalization of MA to higher cardinals. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, **30**:297–306, 1978.
- [ShSi 468] Saharon Shelah and Otmar Spinas. On Gross Spaces. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, **348**:4257–4277, 1996.
- [ShSt 258] Saharon Shelah and Lee Stanley. A theorem and some consistency results in partition calculus. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, **36**:119–152, 1987.